DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 056 823 RC 005 779

AUTHOR	Witherspoon, Gary Jay
TITLE	An Analysis of Community-School Relations in One Suburban and Four Navajo School Districts.
PUB DATE	Dec 69
NOTE	146p.; Master's thesis submitted to Arizona State University, Tempe
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*American Indians; *Boards of Education; *Education; Federal Programs; *Government Role; History; Masters Theses; *Parent Attitudes; Parent Influence; Religious Factors; Reservations (Indian); Rural Urban Differences; School District Autonomy
IDENTIFIERS	Navajos

ABSTRACT

The primary concern of this research was with community-school relations in American Indian education, particularly Navajo education. Major data on which this study was based came from interviews with 223 parents whose children attended various types of schools in Arizona during 1967-68: Nazlini (Bureau of Indian Affairs), Many Farms (BIA and public), Rough Rock (community), Kayenta (public), and 2 Tempe schools (public). The interview questions focused on 2 major areas: (1) parental knowledge and understanding of the school and (2) parental feelings and attitudes toward the school and its programs. It was revealed, for example, that 64% of the parents at Rough Rock were pleased with the local school board, while no more than 1 in 4 parents in the other Navajo areas was satisfied with the local board. Also, the parents at Rough Rock knew more things they liked and disliked about the school. The Tempe group, however, was better informed concerning the functions of school boards than were any of the other parent groups. The Tempe group also had better teacher-parent understanding and cooperation than did the Navajo Reservation schools. Two related documents, ED 047 847 and ED 024 497, were used for comparative purposes in this study. (LS)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH.
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED0 56823

AN ANALYSIS OF COMMUNITY-SCHOOL RELATIONS IN ONE SUBURBAN AND FOUR NAVAJO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

A Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of the School of Education
Arizona State University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
Gary Jay Witherspoon
December 1969

RC 005779

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

I. THE PROBLEM AND THE PROCEDURES EMPLOYED 1

II. A BRIEF HISTORY OF COMMUNITY-SCHOOL RELATIONS IN AMERICAN EDUCATION 10

III. A BRIEF HISTORY OF INDIAN EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES 15

IV. THE RESULTS OF 223 PARENT INTERVIEWS 38

V. RELATED RESEARCH 93

VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 128

BIBLIOGRAPHY 138

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

I. Number of Navajo Children in Various Kinds of Schools in 1955 35

II. Numbers and Places of Parents Interviewed . . 39

III. Responses to Interview Question 1: What do You Like About the School Your Child Attends? 43

IV. Number of Positive Responses to Question 1 . 47

V. Responses to Interview Question 2: What Don't you Like About the School Your Child Attends? 48

VI. Number of Negative Responses to Question 2 50

VII. Comparison of Positive and Negative Responses to Questions 1 and 2 52

VIII. Parental Knowledge of School Program Based on Positive and Negative Responses to Questions 1 and 2 54

IX. Responses to Interview Question 3: Is There a School Board for the School Your Child Attends? 55

X. Responses to Corollary Question to Interview Question 3: If Yes (to Previous Question), Who is on the Board? 56

XI. Responses to Interview Question 4: What Does the School Board Do? 59

TABLE PAGE

XII. Responses to Interview Question 5: Are You Satisfied With the Local School Board? 61

XIII. Responses to Interview Question 6: Do You Feel It Is Good For the Local People to Have Control Over the Schools Their Children Attend? . . . 62

XIV. Reasons for Responses to Interview Question 6 63

XV. Responses to Interview Question 7: Do You Know Your Child's Teacher? . . . 66

XVI. Responses to Interview Question 8: Did You Know You Are Encouraged To Visit Your Child's Classroom? 68

XVII. Responses to Interview Question 9: What Do Your Children Learn at School? . . 70

XVIII. Responses to Interview Question 10: What Should Your Children Learn That They Are Not Now Learning? 73

XIX. Responses to Interview Question 11: Do You Think Your Children Should Learn About the Navajo Way of Life at School? 75

XX. Responses to Interview Question 12: Would You Like Your Child to Learn to Read and Write the Navajo Language? . 77

TABLE PAGE

XXI. Responses to Interview Question 13: Who Is the Principal (or Head) of the School Your Child Attends? 78

XXII. Responses Rating Performance of Principal: Is He Doing a Good Job? 79

XXIII. Responses to Added Question A: Would You Rather Have Your Children Attend a Day School or Live in a Dormitory? . . 81

XXIV. Responses to Added Question B: Do You Think It Is Good for Parents to Work in the Dormitory On a Rotation Basis? 83

XXV. Responses to Added Question C: Is It Good For Your Children To Come Home On the Weekends? 85

XXVI. Responses to Added Question D: How Is the Public School at Kayenta Different From BIA Schools? 86

XXVII. Responses to Added Question E: How Is the Demonstration School Different from BIA and Public Schools? 88

XXVIII. Responses to Added Question F: Would You Prefer to Have the Demonstration School Continue at Rough Rock or Would You Rather Have a BIA School at Rough Rock? 90

TABLE PAGE

XXIX. Reasons for Answers to Added Question F: Why Do You Prefer the Rough Rock Demonstration School? 91

XXXX. Responses to Interview Question 1 Compared to Results of Chicago Study: What Do You Like About the School Your Child Attends? 101

XXXI. Responses to Interview Question 2 Compared With the Results of the Chicago Study: What Don't You Like About the School Your Child Attends? . . 103

XXXII. Responses to Interview Question 3 Compared With the Results of the Chicago Study: Does the School Your Child Attends Have a School Board (or Education Committee)? 106

XXXIII. Responses to Corollary Question to Interview Question 3 Compared to the Results of the Chicago Study: Who Is On the Board? 107

XXXIV. Responses to Interview Question 7 Compared to the Results of the Chicago Study: Do You Know Your Child's Teacher? 109

XXXV. Responses to Corollary Question to Interview Question 7 Compared With the Results of the Chicago Study: Has Your

TABLE PAGE

Child's Teacher Visited You At Home? 110

XXXVI. Responses to Interview Question 8 Compared to Results of the Chicago Study: Have You Ever Visited Your Child's Classroom? 112

XXXVII. Responses to Interview Question 10 Compared to the Results of the Chicago Study: What Should Your Child Learn in School That He Is Not Now Learning? . . 114

XXXVIII. Responses to Interview Question 11 Compared to the Results of the Chicago Study: Do You Think Your Child Should Be Taught at School About the Navajo Way of Life? 117

XXXIX. Responses to the Question of the Chicago Study: Is It Being Taught at Your School? 118

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND THE PROCEDURES EMPLOYED

This research is primarily concerned with community-school relations in American Indian education, particularly Navajo education. An attempt is also made to compare community-school relations in non-Indian communities with community-school relations in Indian communities. The major focus of the research is devoted to community-school relations in four Navajo communities and one upper middle-class non-Indian community, but these five situations typify in many ways broader patterns of community-school relations. In addition, studies by others in various communities will also be considered.

The major data on which this study is based comes from interviews with 223 parents whose children attend the various schools involved in the study. The interview questions focused on two major areas: (1) parental knowledge and understanding of the school; and (2) parental feelings and attitudes toward the school and its programs. A more extensive discussion of the researchprocedures will be presented in the chapter covering the results of the research.

In order to see the data obtained in proper perspective, it is necessary to look at the history of American education, and at the ideas and attitudes on which education in America, for both Indian and non-Indian, is supposed to be predicated. This study will begin with some general statements with regard to the almost universally espoused principles of community-school relations in America, followed by a discussion of the heritage and experience out of which these principles developed, and ending with an evaluation of how well they are practiced today in four Indian communities and one non-Indian community.

The general principles which define the roles of the school and the community in American education are deeply rooted in American beliefs in freedom, democracy, basic human rights, and government by the people, for the people, and of the people. After an extensive appraisal of the relationships between education and our basic political principles, the National Commission to Defend Democracy Through Education announced in 1951 the following policy, which was endorsed by the National Education Association, the American Textbook Publishers Institute, the American Library Association, and the John Dewey Society:

> The richest treasure of our American heritage is the democratic aspiration. Deep within this heritage lies our commitment to public education, a commitment which has grown constantly stronger with the years. We believe that our public schools are our chief and most effective means of making this democratic aspiration meaningful in the lives of succeeding generations.

> The public school can meet its responsibilities effectively only if it considers the diversity of interest and experience which characterizes the communities of our land. To bar from the school any sincere and honest view is to deny the essence of the democratic aspiration: to give priority to a single exclusive system of beliefs would likewise deny the essence of this aspiration.
>
> The success with which the public school does its job depends upon the interest, support, and participation of all the citizens of every American community.[1]

Nearly all outstanding educators have endorsed the principles which insist on the rights of the local citizenry to formulate the policies according to which the school operates. Gordon McCloskey, in his excellent book, Education and Public Understanding, comments on this principle:

> Since schooling plays such a crucial part in individual and group well-being, our people have long insisted on their right to participate in formulating educational policy. Educators, knowing the values of active public interest and the dangers of dictatorship, have long endorsed the principle of public control and encouraged public participation.[2]

In their book on school public relations, James Jones and Irving Stout comment on the role of the school as an institution of the people:

> The school system must function within the framework or pattern of values,

---

[1] Reprinted in Education Digest, November, 1951, 11:32-33.

[2] Gordon McCloskey, Education and Public Understanding (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1959), p. 3.

> traditions, attitudes, and concepts of the people . . . and the school is expected to employ personnel who will carry out these ideas.[3]

In his book The Role of School in American Society, V. T. Thayer concludes that the general principle is that "the school is a supplementary institution, an agency established and maintained by a community in order to afford its young, through collective effort, what its members value for them but are unable to provide individually."[4]

In Social Perspectives on Education, Dorothy Westby-Gibson states that "in a democratic society the control of education, as of government, basically resides in the people."[5] She further adds that "schools are never separate institutions; they depend for their very existence on the communities of whichthey are a part."[6]

Local control over schools is institutionalized in school boards or boards of education. Mrs. Fred A. Radke stated in 1964, while president of the National School Boards Association, that the basis for progress in American education is local control.[7] Local control generally means the rights of the local citizen to elect and recall their representatives on a board of education. The school board selects the school staff, prepares and approves the school budget, establishes the policies governing the operation of the school, approves the curriculum, and in general acts as the governing body of the school.[8]

---

[3] James J. Jones and Irving W. Stout, School Public Relations (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1960), p. 120.

[4] V. T. Thayer, The Role of the School in American Society (New York: Dodd, Mead, and Co., 1960), p. 45.

[5] Dorothy Westby-Gibson, Social Perspectives on Education (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965), p. 261.

[6] Ibid., p. 277.

[7] "Local Control: Secret of School's Success," Nations Business, February, 1964, p. 68.

Another general principle in school-community relations in American society is that of theright, opportunity and necessity of community and especially parental participation in the school program. The opportunity to elect school board members is the first and most fundamental way in which people participate in the school program, but participation must go much further if it is to be most effective.

Sumption and Engstrom lay down what they see as the fundamental operational principles for good and effective community-school relations and parental participation:

> 1. The cooperative efforts of professional and lay people are necessary to make the school what it ought to be.
>
> 2. What the school is to do and be must be decided by the citizens.
>
> 3. The actual operation of the school is the responsibility of the professional school workers.
>
> 4. Public participation is essential at all levels.
>
> 5. Lay participation requires professional guidance and counsel for maximum effectiveness.

---

[8] Merle R. Sumption and Yvonne Engstrom, School-Community Relations: A New Approach (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966), pp. 37-47.

6. The legally constituted body for enacting school policy is the school board.

7. Participation should be geared to the total school community.

8. Participation should be based on careful study.

9. Participation should be organized.

10. Participation should be comprehensive.

11. Participation should be adapted to the community.

12. Participation must be learned

13. Participation should culminate in action.[9]

A focal point of community-school relations is most often parent-teacher relations. The interests of both teacher and parent converge in the child. In reporting interviews with nine hundred parents about what they wanted to know about their child's school, Stout and Langdon write the following:

> These parents again and again pointed to the teacher as the most important single factor in their child's school life. The statements related to the teacher and the teacher's relationship to the children outnumber all other groupings, and the statement was made many times that 'the teacher is the key to it all.' Pursuant to this was the reiterated concern about knowing not only the kind of person their child's teacher is but knowing his attitude toward teaching as a profession.[10]

---

[9] Ibid., pp. 157-161.

[10] Irving W. Stout and Grace Langdon, "What Parents Want to Know About Their Child's School," The Nation's Schools, August, 1957, Vol. 60, No. 2, p. 47.

Although under normal conditions a teacher's interest in any one of his or her students will never equal the interest in and concern for the same child as that of the parent of the child, teachers have a fundamental responsibility for correct care and instruction of children entrusted to them. Gordon McCloskey puts it this way:

> We need to assure people that teachers and administrators are interested in children. People have strong emotional attachments to their children, and furthering their children's interest is their main reason for supporting schools. Public appreciation of even the most effective educational services is influenced by the extent to which people understand that our interest in children corresponds to theirs.[11]

To summarize the general principles Americans expect to be followed in teacher-parent relations, the National Education Association Code of Ethics states:

> The members of the teaching profession share with parents the task of shaping each student's progress and acts towards socially accepted ends. The effectiveness of many methods of teaching is dependent upon cooperative relationships with the home.
>
> In fulfilling the obligations of this principle the teacher will
>
> --Respect the basic responsibility of parents for their children.
>
> --Seek to establish friendly and cooperative relationship with the home.
>
> --Help to increase the student's confidence in his own home and avoid disparaging remarks which might undermine that confidence.

---

[11] Gordon McCloskey, op. cit., p. 178.

> --Provide parents with information that will serve the best interests of their children, and be discreet with information received from parents.[12]

Another principle of community-school relations generally accepted as valid and important is that the school has a responsibility to keep the public informed about what is going on at the school. McCloskey says "people have a right to a thorough understanding of the educational system they are asked to support."[13]

The basic general principles which are supposed to underly community-school relations in American education and which are deep-rooted in our democratic tradition of government by the people and equal education for all can be concisely summarized as follows:

(1) Schools are institutions of the people, to serve the people, to respect their values and beliefs, and to be underthe control and direction of the people whose children attend them.

(2) Extensive participation of parents in the school program is a right, an obligation, and a necessity. Schools must encourage and stimulate such participation.

(3) Teachers and parents have a mutual responsibility to work together to serve the best interests of the child, recognizing the basic responsibility of parents for their

---

[12] "New NEA Code of Ethics," National Education Association Journal, September, 1952, p. 372.

[13] Gordon McCloskey, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

children and respecting the teachings and relationships formed in the home.

(4) Schools have a responsibility to provide parents with assessible, accurate, and adequate information about the school program and operation.

Having articulated four basic principles of community-school relations in America with which nearly everyone agrees, the task ahead in this thesis is to look at the American heritage and experience out of which these principles were developed and gained recognition and acceptance. Next the history of education among Indians of the United States will be examined to see how and why it has followed or gone astray from these basic principles. Finally, the current situations in four Navajo communities and one non-Indian community will be examined on the basis of data collected to see to what extent the basic American principles of community-school relations are being followed in each of the five communities.

CHAPTER II

A BRIEF HISTORY OF COMMUNITY-SCHOOL RELATIONS IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

A noted educator, Leslie W. Kindred, concisely describes the character of the public schools in America:

> The American public school exists for, belongs to, and is controlled by the people. It derives its public character from the historical background from which it emerged and the legal structure within which it functions.[14]

This chapter will briefly trace the unique history of formal education in America.

History demonstrates the efficacy and wisdom of citizen participation in school affairs. In early Greek forums, individual citizens combined their thinking about educational goals and procedures to formulate concepts which continue to this day to influence democratic government and schooling.[15]

In the United States public education owes its origin and much of its development to the efforts of local citizens. In early New England a number of communities in their town meetings established schools in advance of legislation by the General Court requiring all towns to do so.[16] With the advent of general legislation in 1642 and 1647, the responsibility for enforcement was lodged directly in the hands of the "chosen men appointed to manage the prudential affairs" of the town, rather than in state officials.[17]

---

[14] Leslie W. Kindred, School Public Relations (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1957), p. 4.

[15] Gordon McCloskey, op. cit., p. 364.

As towns came to grant to outlying districts the privilege of establishing and maintaining their own schools, local self-determination in the conduct of education became firmly grounded in practice and theory.[18] As settlers moved westward, they carried withthem this concept of the local school district. The settlers met in thousands of town meetings to devise means of educating their children. Local histories are full of accounts of citizens contributing labor and materials to erect buildings, of committees writing letters "back home" to find teachers, and of cooperative efforts to raise funds to pay the teachers.[19]

McCloskey discusses the development of the local boards of education:

> Our local school boards evolved as an embodiment of the democratic idea that the right and responsibility to exercise control over public school policies resides with citizens or their elected representatives.... They were created because, as communities grew larger, and more complex, citizens recognized that they could no longer formulate and ad-

---

[16] V. T. Thayer, _op. cit._, p. 48.

[17] _Ibid._

[18] _Ibid._

[19] Gordon McCloskey, _op. cit._, p. 365.

> minister all local policies in town meetings. Consequently they delegated to local boards the responsibility of studying facts and shaping policies which would be periodically submitted to the electorate for approval.[20]

In the early part of the nineteenth century, informed laymen also recognized the need for state school systems, and again they, rather than professional educators, exercised most of the leadership to which we owe our state educational legislation. It is important to note that Horace Mann, Henry Barnard, and Thaddeus Stevens were laymen.[21]

Local direction and control was not accepted in every case without some resistance on the part of professional educators. Boston educators strenuously opposed Horace Mann's efforts to create a state school system on the grounds that it represented an attack on the adequacy of their work. Thaddeus Stevens encountered similar opposition in his work in Pennsylvania.[22] The faulty sense of educational proprietorship has to one degree or another always existed.

Although local control and direction of schools has always been a basic part of American democracy, the legal structure within which public schools operate makes education a function of the state. The right of individual states to develop and supervise their own school systems comes out of the Tenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. This amendment provides that those powers not delegated to the federal government are state powers. Because no reference is made in the Constitution to education, the power to establish schools belongs to the states.

---

[20] Ibid.

[21] Ibid., p. 366.

[22] Ibid., p. 367.

In The Role of the School in American Society, Thayer comments on the unique relationship of local and state supervision and of schools:

> How do we explain the fact that school systems which are both created by the state and subject to its control and regulation are, nevertheless, thought of as essentially local in authority and responsibility?
>
> The answer is found, in part, in the American tradition of local self-government, a tradition which derives from the peculiarities of settlement in the colonial period and which was reaffirmed by each generation thereafter as individuals and groups, in the course of the conquest of the continent, constantly penetrated into new areas and established new communities in advance of a central government. In part, also, the explanation lies in the manner in which the state related itself to education in the early stages of development. Were we to consider the relation of local schools to the state as analagous to that of child and parent, we should have to say that the child is father of the parent.[23]

Analyzing the legal structure within which schools function, Leslie Kindred concludes:

> It is evident from the legal structure of the state school system and the laws which govern

---

[23] V. T. Thayer, op. cit., pp. 47-48.

> its operation that the power to manage schools resides in the people. On a state-wide basis they have the right to support or oppose suggested legislation affecting the education of children, to work for the repeal and modification of existing laws, and to decide at the polls who shall represent them in the legislature. This right is paralleled at the local level, where they elect fellow citizens to membership on the board of education to carry out their will. To insure expression of the popular will, the law prescribes that any parent or citizen shall have the privilege of being heard at a regular meeting of the board or to file a written communication setting forth his ideas on matters of educational policy and practice.... The American people conceived the board of education to be a public body, operating with their consent, and they took measures to insure that its character would not change.[24]

In the preceeding pages, a brief discussion has been presented which illustrates the meaning and validity of the statement on which this chapter began:

> The American public school exists for, belongs to, and is controlled by the people. It derives its public character from the historical background from which it emerged and the legal structure within which it functions.[25]

---

[24] Leslie W. Kindred, op. cit., pp. 7-8.

[25] Ibid., p. 4.

CHAPTER III

A BRIEF HISTORY OF INDIAN EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Education among American Indians is as old as the race and tribes themselves are. Education is not an invention of the white man, nor is it the sole possession of so-called "modern" societies. Every society has a means of socializing its youth and transmitting its culture. Most American Indian tribes had highly effective educational programs and institutions before the coming of Columbus.

Indigenous education among American Indians existed in varying degrees of formality. For the most part, Indian children learned the liveways of their tribe from their kinsmen. In many cases, specific kinsmen were assigned to instruct the child in a particular area of cultural knowledge or needed skills. In other cases, children learned through informal observation and participation. Degrees of educational attainment were formalized and institutionalized in rites of initiation, puberty ceremonies, and other events somewhat similar in purpose to graduation exercises in western societies.

Initiation training of young people by some of the Pueblo tribes of the Southwest provides a good example of formal education among American Indians. In one case in

1925, a whole tribe defied the United States government by announcing its readiness to go to jail and stay there because the government had suspended the initiation training of its boys. John Collier provides a brief account of the incident:

> Our government knew nothing, but assumed that boys are bad, and of course Indians are bad Indians. The tribe knew that its hold upon the future, the persistence of its tradition, of its religion, of its emotional orientation, of its ancient soul which involved the world-soul, were dependent on the adolescent disciplines. The Tribe prevailed. We who were close to the Indians watched the disappearance of boys from public view. Even their fathers saw them no more. After sometimes a year, sometimes eighteen months, the boys returned--from the underground kivas, from the pathless areas of the Sangre de Cristo range, from the hidden crag where perhaps burns the mythical everlasting fire. Radiant of face, full-rounded and powerful of body, modest, detached: they were men now, keepers of the secrets, houses of the Spirit, reincarnations of the countless generations of their race; with "reconditional reflexes," with emotions organized toward their community, with a connection formed until death between their individual beings and that mythopoic universe--that cosmic illusion--that real world--as the case may be . . . make of adolescence the crisis of second birth, and the marriage of the individual with the race, and the marriage of the race with the universe.[26]

The patterns of education mentioned here are in full accord with the tradition of education in America; that is, education for, of, and by the parents and those most directly concerned with the child's welfare. In fact, most of the precious principles of education in America have their beginnings in ideas and practices dominant among American Indians. Our ethnocentric historians have failed to see that what is most distinctively American about America is that which has been adopted from the Indians:

---

[26] John Collier, Sr., "Fullness of Life Through Leisure," printed in Mind-Body Relationship, Jay B. Nash, ed. (New York: A. S. Barnes and Co., 1931), p. 78.

> American history, written by the scribes of the conquerors, has been written as the story of a great European conquest. What was conquered according to the European historians and their students, was an almost empty land, dotted here and there with wild savages. These children of the wilderness, unable to live alongside civilization, proceeded to disappear as their land was settled. The "vanishing Indian" became the theme song and folklore of painting and sculpture, of fiction and of the special sort of fiction that sometimes passes as American history. How far this oft-told story deviates from the truth we are only beginning to discover.[27]

The historians of the conqueror have not always been totally blind to what happened to the settlers of America. TheIndian's love of freedom and liberty, which defeated attempts to establish Indian slavery, quickly spread to the white invaders. This quality of Indian life was noted in 1776 in a popular account of America, widely circulated in England:

> The darling passion of the American is liberty and that in its fullest extent; nor is it the original natives only to whom this passion is confined; our colonists sent thither seem to have imbibed the same principles.[28]

There is not space enough here to elaborate the many, many influences Indian life and culture had on the European colonists. Let it just be said that the Indian pattern of self-government undermined the patterns which the colonists brought to this country--patterns of feudalism, landlordism, intolerance, and divine right of kings.[29]

---

[27] Felix S. Cohen, The Legal Conscience (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960), p. 312.

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 314.

The principle of American democracy is that self-government is better than expert government. Indian leaders again and again refuse to make decisions for their people until the decision is thoroughly thrashed out in the councils of the people and agreement is reached. This deference to the public will has been a major source of sustaining strength for American democracy, both Indian and non-Indian. It is strange and most unfortunate that the course of Indian education in this country did not follow this tradition.

Indians had self-directed and locally controlled educational practices and institutions for themselves, and their white neighbors followed this tradition in establishing locally controlled and directed schools. Somehow in the process of the white man establishing schools for Indians, the principle of local control was forgotten or ignored. The reasons for not following a tradition solidly imbedded in both cultures in a cross-cultural situation are open to speculation and informed guess-work. The history of Indian education in America provides some clues.

Schools for Indians were established for several reasons. Missionaries saw schools as a way of "Christianizing" Indians.

---

[29] Ibid., p. 325.

Would-be friends of the Indians saw schooling as a way to "civilize" the Indian. Land-hungry whites saw Indian schools as a way to "tame" Indians and take their lands, or to remove them to other places.

> It should be noted that the Government intended to use education not merely to "civilize" the Indians and to obtain land cessions thereby, but intended also to induce their removal altogether by offering educational advantages at the place to which they might remove.[30]

The dwindling subsistence base of the Indian, the loss or irrelevancy of traditional social institutions and cultural beliefs, and the feeling of a need to compete with the white man led many Indians to entertain the idea of having their children go to schools after the order of the white man. The initial experience in this cross-cultural education proved unsatisfactory. When the leaders of Virginia, after signing a treaty with six Indian nations, offered to educate six Indian youths, the Indians, although responding with thanks, rejected the offer, citing previous experiences with the schools of the white man. They said their young men previously sent to white schools had returned--

> ...bad runners, ignorant of every means of living in the woods; unable to bear the cold or hunger; they knew neither how to build a cabin, take a deer, or kill an enemy; spoke our language imperfectly; were therefore neither fit for hunters, warriors, or counselors; they were totally good for nothing.

---

[30] Abraham E. Knepler, "Eighteenth Century Cherokee Educational Efforts," Chronicles of Oklahoma, March, 1942, Vol. XX: 1:61.

> We are, however, . . . obliged by your kind offer, . . . and to show our sense of it, if the gentlemen of Virginia will send us a dozen of their sons, we will . . . instruct them in all we know, and make men of them.[31]

Indians were first put in schools in 1568 in Havana, Cuba. This school was run by Jesuit missionaries for Indians of Florida. From 1568 to 1860, schools enrolling Indians were almost entirely run and operated by missionaries. The organized efforts of the churches resulted in the appropriation of federal aid in 1819, which continued until an act in 1917 made federal aid to religious schools illegal.[32]

The main idea of the mission schools was to "civilize" and "Christianize" the Indian. Accordingly, Reverend Eleazor Wheelock conceived of the idea of boarding schools. He felt that if the children were removed from parental influence the process of "civilization" would be speeded up.[33] From these early beginnings until now, Indian parents have been viewed as an obstacle in the education of their children; and the school, far from being an institution under parental direction, has been thought of as a means of liberating the child from parental influence and control.

In response to peace treaty agreements wherein the government agreed to support schools for Indians, the first Federal school for Indians was established in 1860.[34] Many more followed, but the supply has never caught up with the need. Following the example of the missionaries, the boarding school was preferred in order "to free the children from the language and habits of their untutored and often-times savage parents."[35]

---

[31] U. S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Branch of Education, Orienting New Employees (Chilocco, Oklahoma: Chilocco School Press, 1956), pp. 9-10.

[32] Robert A. Roessel, Jr., Handbook for Indian Education (Los Angeles: Amerindian Publishing Company), p. 4.

[33] Ibid., p. 4.

When the United States assumed some responsibility in providing educational institutions for the Indian peoples of this nation, it was the beginning of a tragic, wasteful, and discouraging experience. Strongly attached to the vastly different culture of their parents, Indian children attended schools that were dedicated to the ultimate eradication of all traits of Indian culture. It was thought that if a child could be taken young enough and far enough away from the influence of family and tribe, he would forget his family and tribal ties and become assimilated in the mainstream of American society. However, these high expectations were never realized.

Forbidden to speak their native tongue in school, out of touch with family and tribal life, denied the normal experience and education needed to prepare them for life as Indians, the children would return from school home dissatisfied misfits, unable to readapt themselves to reservation life among their own people and equally unable to find a place in a white community. The Indian students had learned to read and write but they were unfamiliar with the customs and language of their own people and found their schooling to be of little use in making a living.

---

[34] Ibid., p. 5, citing Hildegard Thompson, "Institutional Aspects of Indian Education," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science: American Indians and American Life (Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1957), p. 97.

[35] Ibid., citing the Annual Report of the Indian Commissioner to the Secretary of the Interior, 1885, p. 23.

One writer characterized the situation thusly:

> Indian education closely trailed the development of the public school system with slight relationship to Indian needs. The difficulty lay in the slavish imitation of the white school. The empty, expensive, time-consuming education program for the Indian did not bring to him economic betterment, nor did it destroy his native way of life, as it so woefully intended, because his school followed a sterile path and made only a tip-of-the-wing contact with his tribal experience and his actual reservation surroundings.[36]

In recent years, more and more Indians have been attending public schools. Although many of these public schools have provisions for local control, clever administrators and white majorities or minorities using questionable tactics, have usually prevented Indian parents from having any voice in school programs and policies. It was claimed that Indian parents were not interested in schools; or, if interested, not qualified.

With schools often far removed from Indian communities and with educational programs designed to remove the child from any influence of parent or tribe, it is hardly necessary to say that little positive community-school relations occurred in the history of Indian education. There are a few important exceptions, however. Among these, the self-directed schools of the so-called Five Civilized Tribes are the most important. Brewton Berry in his survey of the literature on Indian education comments on these unusual cases:

---

[36] Evelyn C. Adams, American Indian Education (New York: King Crown Press, 1946), p. 125.

> It is a mistake to think that formal education is entirely a device which the white man has sought to impose upon the Indian. As early as 1791 the Senecas were begging George Washington for teachers so that their men might be taught to farm and build houses, their women to spin and weave, and their children to read and write. The Cherokees quickly perceived that knowledge and education were useful, and they set about to build their own school system, controlled by themselves and supported with Tribal funds. . . . By 1852 the Cherokees had a flourishing school system of 21 schools, two academies, and an enrollment of 1,100. The Choctaws were soon followed by Creeks, Chickasaws, and Seminoles. It is interesting to speculate how different the situation might be today had the Indians retained control of their school system, rather than having it fall into the hands of a paternalistic government.[37]

These schools were supported by funds from the United States government for land cessions in Georgia and removal to Oklahoma. These schools had positive relations with the Indian people whom they served, because the schools were their schools. This successful school system had a positive effect on the whole tribe, and assisted the people in improving their living conditions.[38] Probably the most successful experience any Indian tribe has had with schooling came to an end when in 1906 the tribal governments of these tribes were dissolved, and federal control of the schools was established. Today among the Cherokee, community-school relations are as poor, student achievement as low, and drop out rates as high as those in most other Indian communities.[39]

---

[37] Brewton Berry, The Education of American Indians: A Survey of the Literature, U. S. Congress, Senate, Special Subcommittee on Indian Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (Washington D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969), pp. 12-13.

Because this paper is in particular dealing with community-school relations in several Navajo communities, it would be worthwhile to review the specific history of education among the Navajo. Davida Woerner has made a study of the history of education among the Navajo, which covers the period of 1868 to 1940. A brief review of his findings will be presented here.

Woerner characterizes the period from 1868 to 1882 as the years of neglect. In the Treaty of 1868, the United States agreed that "for every 30 children between said ages (6 to 16) who can be induced or compelled to attend school, a house shall be provided and a teacher

---

[38] Abraham E. Knepler, "Education in the Cherokee Nation," Chronicles of Oklahoma, December, 1943, Vol. XXI: 4: p. 378-401.

[39] U. S., Congress, Senate, Hearings: Special Indian Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, 90th Congress, 1st and 2nd Sessions, Part 2, 1968, pp. 537-541.

. . . shall be furnished."[40]

With good will and with faith in the promises of a mighty nation, the Navajo returned to their home country. Their first lesson was that official promises may be fragile things, and that, in large part, convenience determines the extent of their fulfillment. In the years after 1868, the United States grievously failed to honor treaty obligations.

The earliest attempts at providing schools for Navajos were made by Presbyterian missionaries, supported by federal funds. Reverend James Roberts and Miss Charity Baston opened the first school for the Navajo in 1869. It was a day school and attendance was irregular, averaging fourteen pupils.[41] After a curriculum consisting of the three R's proved unpopular and unsuccessful, attempts were made at mechanical, agricultural and various other forms of vocational education. These attempts proved to be almost equally ineffective.[42]

While formal education was achieving very little, the material progress of the Navajos after 1871 was remarkable indeed. Woerner says that the "Navajo transformed themselves, mainly through attention to their flocks and herds, from a band of paupers to a comparatively prosperous Indian nation."[43]

---

[40] Davida Woerner, "Education Among the Navajo; an Historical Study" (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. of Education, Columbia University, 1941), p. 19, citing 57th Congress, 1st Session, Senate Document No. 452, Indian Affairs, ed. Charles J. Kappler (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1903), II, p. 783.

[41] Ibid., pp. 21-22.

[42] Ibid., pp. 23-25.

Navajo leaders and parents returned from Ft. Sumner with a keen interest in education for their children. This keen interest soon turned to apathy and even hostility, as the situation in many ways went from bad to worse. Woerner discusses the reasons Navajos became disallusioned with the schools established for their benefit:

> So far as the Navajo were concerned, the formal education which the white man brought in this period could scarcely excite enthusiasm. It was difficult for the Navajo to see merit in white methods of farming which were without result on arid land, in power weaving which was devoid of individual creation and inspiration, and it was impossible for them to understand the stream of directions in a foreign tongue which was given by a succession of culturally unsympathetic agents and teachers. To these shortcomings must be added the deplorable lack of physical facilities for an educational program.[44]

While the Navajo were neglected on the reservation, their children found things worse in off-reservation boarding schools. Several scouts were sent out to obtain Navajos for Indian schools in the East, particularly Carlisle. At Carlisle the Navajos were treated as "ignorant pagans." Among the Navajo children sent to Carlisle were three sons of Manuelito.[45]

---

[43] *Ibid.*, p. 26.

[44] *Ibid.*, p. 27.

In 1883 Dennis Riordan became the new agent to the Navajo, and he proved to be better than those before him who could not have been much worse. He sought more funds and better facilities for Navajo education and took a more sympathetic attitude toward the Navajo. Setbacks in Riordan's progressive moves came when a number of Navajo students died while at Carlisle, including two sons of Manuelito and one of headman Torlino. For several years after this, Navajos refused to cooperate with the boarding school policy. Police had to be installed in classrooms to see that the Navajos did not leave.[46]

While conscientious endeavor broadly characterized Navajo education during the years 1883-1889, there was a failure to achieve gains and goals of fundamental importance. Although many Navajo questioned the utility of the instruction provided, they distrusted the schools more as institutions which brought sickness and even death to their children.

In 1892 Dana Shipley arrived in Navajoland, full of determination to make the Navajo good Americans by forcing their children to attend school. When he tried to collect some children at Round Rock, Agent Shipley was met by Black Horse and a party of thirty men. According to reports, they addressed Agent Shipley as follows:

---

[45] _Ibid._, pp. 30-31, 36.

[46] _Ibid._, pp. 36-37.

> We do not want your education. We do not want anything to do with white men. We want none of the white man's ways. We ask nothing of the Government but to be let alone, and you shall not take those children.[48]

Shipley was threatened with death if he did not comply with demand for "closing down the school." Black Horse and his followers assaulted Shipley, and it was only through the intervention of Chee Dodge and through the escape of a policeman to Tse-a-lee where Lieutenant Brown and his ten men were stationed, that order was restored. Shipley emerged beaten, but alive. The children were not taken, and the Navajos, for the most part, remained hostile toward schooling for their children.[49]

Navajo attitudes toward education began to change after a wise move by Lieutenant Plummer, Shipley's replacement. Lieutenant Plummer organized and planned a visit by fifteen Navajo leaders to the Columbian Exposition at Chicago (1893). The Indian Rights Association generously supplied the funds for the trip. Not only did the fifteen Navajo recognize that there were material advantages to be gained through the white man's schools, but they made formal reports to their fellow Navajo. They urged other Navajos to put their children in school, "no difference how you love them." Accordingly, the Fort Defiance Boarding

---

[48] Ibid., p. 45, citing Twenty-fourth Annual Report of the Board of Indian Commissioners, 1892 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1893), p. 134.

[49] Ibid., pp. 44-46.

School became crowded to overflowing with Navajo children.[50]

As the years went by, this renewed hope and trust in the value of education slowly faded as the harshness of the boarding school program became more real and the fond hopes for a better life through education became more unreal. In 1907 Superintendent Shelton and Commissioner Leupp tried to compel Navajos to comply with the government's rules and educational program. The policy resulted in a shameful event and increased hostility toward education on the part of most Navajos.

A Navajo leader, By-a-lil-le and his band strenuously opposed the policies of Shelton. In response to By-a-lil-le's dissent with official policy, Shelton sent troops to the camp of By-a-lil-le's group at daybreak on October 29, 1907, and By-a-lil-le and his men were put under arrest. The noise aroused other Navajo in surrounding hogans, and, during the commotion, the military claimed that a gun was fired. The soldiers then opened fire on the Navajos, killing two Navajos and wounding others.[51]

Eight Navajos were taken as prisoners and sent to Fort Huachuca, Arizona, under military guard. They were confined to hard labor. No trial was held, either civil or military. The Indian Rights Association reviewed the case, and began habeas corpus proceedings which ultimately led to the release of the "prisoners" and a strong rebuke of the policy that put them there by the Supreme Court of Arizona.[52]

---

[50] Ibid., pp. 46-47.

[51] Ibid., p. 54.

Woerner characterizes the period from 1912-1933 as The Years of Criticism. Everyone was dissatisfied with the program for Navajo education, but little was done about it beyond talking. There were discussions on the relative merits of boarding vs. day schools, on the folly of preparing Navajos in an inefficient manner to be lowly laborers and of calling the process "vocational education," on the policy of enforced attendance, on the superficiality with which education had touched the Navajo, and on the personnel of the schools.[53]

In 1923 the Navajo Council protested the forcible seizure of very young children, who were taken to overcrowded boarding schools in a foreign environment. Chee Dodge pointed out that, considering the high per centage of runaway children, it was difficult to see how a child could get much education when he or she spent half the time on the road, and when the method of getting children to go to school made them hate and fear it in the first place.[54] Although many admitted the point, little change in policy occurred.

---

[52] Ibid., pp. 54-55.

[53] Ibid., pp. 81-82.

[54] Ibid., p. 108.

In 1932 Oliver la Farge proposed an experimental school for the Navajo. According to La Farge's plan, initial contacts would be made with the people of the community to be served by the school. The people would decide what their educational desires and needs were, and a program would be established to meet them. La Farge further suggested that provisions be made for community education, for the teaching of tribal history and culture, and for the involvement of parents in the school program.[55] It is unfortunate that it took 34 years to actually begin such a school.

Woerner describes the period from 1933 to 1941 as The Years of Experimentation. The years of criticism and dissatisfaction were a prelude to change. The Collier administration began community day schools, attempted instruction in Navajo language and culture, made attendance voluntary, and introduced a curriculum that was thought of as more practical for the Navajo.[56] Given an opportunity to choose, the Navajos might well have asked for these changes. But when they were forced upon the Navajo, along with forcing Navajos to buy school clothing for their children while at the same time outrageously destroying in the nameof conservation the center, wealth and pride of Navajo life, their sheep, it is little wonder John Collier and anything he suggested was not very popular with the Navajo.

---

[55] Ibid., pp. 118-119.

[56] Ibid., pp. 133-173.

No matter how altruistic John Collier's motives were and how well he understood the needs of the Navajo, without the consent and direction of the people there was little chance of success. Even in the most ardent believers in Indian self-determination, there is a dangerous tendency in brilliant men to feel sure that they know what the Indians want and need, and to follow through with their own ideas with only haphazard consultation with the Indians. Such was likely the case of John Collier with regard to the Navajo. Fortunately, he did better with other tribes.

The bitterness and misunderstanding of the Collier years gave way to the World War II period. Many young Navajo men served in Armed Forces with distinction, especially those who transmitted vital messages through the Navajo language. The war time production and activities also provided many Navajos with work off the reservation. For thousands of Navajos, the war period provided their first experience with life off the reservation. The isolation of the Navajos from the "outside" world was greatly reduced during this period; and, as one might expect, a change in the attitudes of the Navajos toward education occurred.

Attempting to function in a non-Indian environment made many Navajos aware of the advantages of a "good education." When many Navajos returned after the war, the word was spread: There are some real advantages to be gained by going to school. The desire of the Navajos for "education" and the inept educational program and the inadequate facilities became an emergency situation and a disgrace to the nation, to which the Navajos had contributed so much during the war.

During the 1946-1950 period, numerous studies were done and reports written on the Navajo situation. This led to a "long range program for the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi tribes of Indians." The Navajo Yearbook of Planning in Action reviews the major provisions of this bill as it applied to Navajo education:

> The Long Range Act, with respect to education for the Navajo and Hopi Indians, authorized an appropriation of $25,000,000 for: (1) the repair and enlargement of eight existing boarding schools, (2) construction of five new large boarding schools, and (3) the remodelling, enlargement, replacement and/or conversion of 41 day schools to boarding school basis. The objectives of the educational program were: (1) to provide school facilities on the Navajo and Hope Reservations sufficient to provide educational opportunities ultimately to all school age Navajo and Hopi on a boarding or day basis as circumstances might require, (2) to provide for elementary and vocational education of children between the ages of 12-18 years who had not previously attended school, or who were three or more years retarded, (3) to transfer responsibility for the education of Navajo and Hopi children to the public school system as rapidly as possible and (4) to provide high school opportunities on and off the Reservation as required.[57]

---

[57] Robert W. Young, The Navajo Yearbook of Planning in Action (Window Rock, Arizona: Navajo Agency, 1955), p. 2.

Notwithstanding its inadequacy, this act was a major attempt to enlarge and improve educational opportunities. It had the support of most Navajos because it came at a time when they were hungry for the potential good of education. The emphasis from the Navajo as well as the Bureau of Indian Affairs was on quantity rather than quality. Strong values were placed on education, and "the more, the better" attitude dominated the thinking of many Navajos with regard to education. Somehow education was thought of a some kind of a commodity, which was automatically obtained in amounts proportionate to the number of years one went to school.

From a quantative viewpoint, Navajo education made significant advances under the rehabilitation act. The number of Navajo children in school increased from 6,543 in 1945 to 24,560 in 1955. The estimated per centage of Navajo children out of school was 68 per cent in 1945 as compared to 8 per cent in 1955.[58] Some of the intangible costs or disadvantages of education, as well an indication of community-school relations, underly the following cold statistics in Table I.

The statistics in Table I indicate that only about one child in four was not removed from his home and family and put in a dormitory in order to get an "education." Over half of all Navajo children in school were so far

---

[58] *Ibid.*, p. 172.

TABLE I

NUMBER OF NAVAJO CHILDREN IN VARIOUS KINDS OF SCHOOLS IN 1955[59]

Kind of School	Number of Children	Per Centage (approx.)
Off-Reservation Boarding Schools	6,848	27.3
Centralized on Reservation Boarding Schools	6,786	26.9
Local Boarding Schools	1,483	5.7
Local Day Schools	293	1.2
Bordertown Dormitories*	1,315	5.3
Hogan Schools	138	0.6
Trailer Schools	881	3.7
Other (mainly Public and Mission)	6,816	27.3

*These are dormitories built near public schools just off the reservation. The Navajo children stay in these dormitories operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and attend the local non-Indian public schools.

[59] *Ibid.*, pp. 167-171.

removed from their parents that they could not visit their homes any time during the nine-month school year, while another twenty per cent were probably only able to go home once or twice during the school year.

Only about thirty per cent of Navajo children in school in 1955 were attending schools located in their home communities. For the remaining seventy per cent, parental involvement in the educational program of the schools was virtually impossible. Even where the school was located in the community it served, there were usually visible and invisible fences erected around the schools, so much so that the school might as well have been located a hundred miles away. The parents' role in the educational program was well-defined: the parent was to bring the child to school at the beginning of the school year and take him home at the end, with the exception of possibly a home visit or two during major holidays. The school was to do the rest with no interference from the parents.

For the most part, Navajo parents accepted this role without complaint. They indeed had an unselfish love for their children. It takes greater love for one's children to give them up for what the parent feels will ultimately be in the child's best interest, than it does to somewhat selfishly hold onto them. Whether or not those parents who did send their children to school were really doing the best thing for their children is a value judgement, but it remains a remarkable act of unselfish love.

It was probably not until the 1960's that a large number of Navajo parents began to seriously question again the advisability and the quality of the education their children were receiving. People began to wonder if it were an unalterable law of the universe that tribal culture and formal education, schools and communities, and parents and teachers should be opposed to each other, or at least distinctly isolated from one another. Enlightened educators on the reservation also began to wonder if Navajo education could not be significantly improved if these opposing or isolated parts of the Navajo child's experience were brought together in some kind of a meaningful way. It was this feeling that led Navajos to request and education officials to accept the establishment of a demonstration or experimental school which would make a major effort to bring together tribal culture and formal education, the school and the community, and the teachers and the parents into some kind of a unified whole.

The remainder of this thesis is concerned with an evaluation of how well this marriage has taken place in the Rough Rock community, as compared to three other Navajo communities and one non-Navajo community.

CHAPTER IV

THE RESULTS OF THE INTERVIEWS

Interviews with 223 parents were done in five communities with regard to seven different schools. The five communities included four Navajo communities on the reservation and one upper middle class, suburban community at Tempe, Arizona. The reservation communities in which interviewing was done were Rough Rock, Nazlini, Many Farms, and Kayenta. At Nazlini the interviewing was done with regard to the local Bureau of Indian Affairs boarding school. The Monument Valley Public Schools were the focus of the interview questions at Kayenta. In the Many Farms area, some of the parents interviewed had children attending the local public school and others had their children in the local Bureau of Indian Affairs boarding school. Thus the sample included two public schools and two Bureau of Indian Affairs schools serving the Navajo.

The interviews done in Tempe, Arizona, were with parents whose children attended either the Broadmoor Elementary School or the McKenny Junior High School, or both. All interviews at Rough Rock were done with regard to the newly-created (1966) Rough Rock Demonstration School. A complete breakdown of the number of parents interviewed in each area in shown in Table II.

TABLE II

NUMBERS AND PLACES OF PARENTS INTERVIEWED

Place of Interview	Number of Parents
Rough Rock	58
Kayenta (Public)	50
Many Farms (Public)	18
Many Farms (Bureau of Indian Affairs)	22
Nazlini (Bureau of Indian Affairs)	30
Tempe (Broadmoor and McKenny)	45
Total:	223

All interviews were done during the late spring and early summer of 1968, with a few exceptions. The first twenty-eight interviews at Rough Rock and the first eleven at Many Farms were done during the winter of 1966-67, after the demonstration school had been in operation about two years. The remaining thirty interviews at Rough Rock were done in the summer of 1967. The later interviews at Rough Rock show a little more awareness about the new school than do the early ones, but the difference is not great, so the results will be presented together.

A random sample was made of all the parents sending their children to each of the schools involved. In the cases of Rough Rock, Tempe, and Nazlini, the sampling was done from a list of parents provided by the school. At Many Farms the sampling was less precise. The interviewer went to every other home along various roads in the community. All geographical sections of the community were included but not every road. The high school counselor at Kayenta, Terry Hurst, divided the school district into five areas and randomly selected ten families from those residing in each of the ten areas.

All interviewing was done by local residents or people who were well-known in the areas in which they did interviewing. All interviews with Navajo parents were conducted by Navajos in the Navajo language, with a few exceptions where the parents preferred to answer the questions in English. The first twenty-eight interviews at Rough Rock were done by Frank Harvey, while Clark Etsitly did the remaining thirty. Both Frank and Clark were well-known to the people of Rough Rock, even though they both came from neighboring communities. Frank is over fifty years old and Clark is under thirty. Frank was not an employee of the demonstration school at the time he did the interviews, while Clark was employed by the demonstration school during the interview period.

The interviews at Nazlini were done by Jimmy Claw, a local resident who was home for the summer from college. Interviewing at Many Farms was done by Robert Dalton. Robert and his wife were residents of Many Farms and employees of the local Bureau of Indian Affairs boarding school. They were on summer leave during the interviewing period. The interviews at Kayenta were conducted by the community-school coordinator of the Monument Valley Public Schools. Two students of Arizona State and long-time Tempe residents did the interviewing at Tempe.

The interview procedure was very uniform. The questions were asked and theparents were given plenty of time to respond. No suggested answers were provided, and no prodding or probing was done. In one sense, the interviews were like an open-ended questionnaire that was verbally administered. The question or stimulus was as uniform as possible (considering the linguistic problems involved) for all parents, and the interviewer simply recorded the parents' response to the question. No tape recorders were used. If the parent did not wish to respond to a particular question, the interviewer simply proceeded to the next question.

Most of the questions drew a wide variety of answers. Therefore, it is particularly significant when a large number of parents answered questions in similar ways. Thirteen of the questions were exactly the same for all parents. A number of other questions were just asked of one to five of the six groups of parents. The results of the thirteen questions asked to all six groups of parents will be presented first. This will be followed by the results of the questions asked to only a partial number of the 223 parents. The first thirteen questions thus provide the best chance for a comparative analysis, but some of the other questions and responses are also helpful and enlightening.

The results of the interviewing will be presented on tables for each question. Under the question, the most frequent answers from each group will be listed. "Most frequent" means any answer which at least ten per cent of the respondents from that particular group gave. The procedure will be more clear after dealing with some actual results, as shown in Table III.

In looking at the responses listed in Table II, it must be remembered that these are all responses generated by the parents. When 57 per cent of the parents asked Question One at Nazlini answered, "My children receive good

TABLE III

RESPONSES TO INTERVIEW QUESTION ONE: WHAT DO YOU LIKE ABOUT THE SCHOOL YOUR CHILD ATTENDS?

Most Frequent Responses	Per Cent So Responding
Nazlini:	
My children receive good care.	57
The school is close to home.	47
No response	20
It provides a good education for my children.	13
Many Farms (BIA):	
It provides a good education for my children.	64
My children receive good care.	32
The children are well disciplined.	23
My children like the school.	18
Many Farms (Public):	
It provides a good education for my children.	39
My children like the school.	22
The school has good teachers.	17
It is just a fair school.	11
Kayenta (Public):	
It provides a good education for my children.	38
The school is run well.	20
No response	16
Rough Rock:	
The school provides instruction in both Navajo and Anglo cultures.	60

TABLE III (continued)

Most Frequent Responses	Per Cent So Responding
Rough Rock (continued):	
The school has an arts and crafts program for adults.	35
The school has many programs and activities for the community.	31
Local people are given preference for employment.	31
Parents work in the dormitories.	22
The school is locally controlled through the school board.	12
The school has good teachers.	10
Tempe:	
The school has good teachers.	31
The school is close to home.	18
No response	18
The school attempts to meet the individual needs of the students.	11

care," it means that 57 per cent of the parents independently identified this aspect of the school as something they liked. The parents were permitted to identify as manyor as few items as they wished. Any particular response which was not made by at least ten per cent of the parents of a particular group is not shown above.

It can be noted from the above that the "no response" category was above ten per cent for three of the groups (Nazline 20%, Kayenta 16%, and Tempe 18%). The failure to respond to this question probably indicates that the parent either is not well-pleased with anything in particular about the school or feels he or she knows very little about the school. In the other three groups of parents, less than ten per cent of the parents in each group failed to respond to the question. This means that in these three groups (Many Farms BIA and Public, and Rough Rock) over ninety per cent of the parents identified at least one thing they liked about the school. Assuming that the procedures utilized in arriving at the figures shown in Table III above are now clear, this paper will proceed to analyze some of the possible significance in the responses listed in Table III.

From a community-school relations perspective, the responses above seem particularly significant. In all cases except Rough Rock, the parents identified the proper care and instruction of children as the things they liked about the school. There was no mention (above ten per cent) of any community-school programs or parental involvement, while at Rough Rock nearly all of the responses concerned how the school related to the interests, desires, and values of the parents. This indicates that the parents at Rough Rock are aware of the "community school" orientation of their school and are very pleased with it.

The number of items identified per respondent can be used as a possible guage for how positive the parent feels about the school and how much the parent knows about the school. Therefore, a compilation of the number of items identified by the parents is illustrated in Table IV.

If the total number of positive responses to this question is an indication of the parents' attitude toward and knowledge of the school, it is clear that the Rough Rock group is significantly higher than the others.

The second question is somewhat of a companion question to the first. The responses to it can be found in Table V.

The responses to this question tend to indicate that Navajo parents, like Anglo parents, are more willing to identify things they like about their schools than things they dislike. The most frequent response, in all groups but one, was no response. The only group of parents which showed a significant dissatisfaction with their school was the group sending their children to the Many Farms Public School. It is also interesting that both public schools serving Navajos were criticized more than the local

TABLE IV

NUMBER OF POSITIVE RESPONSES TO QUESTION ONE

Responses	Nazlini	Many Farms BIA	Many Farms Public	Kayenta	Rough Rock	Tempe
Number of parents interviewed	30	22	18	50	58	45
Total number of positive responses	40	30	18	45	128	54
Number of positive responses per parent	1.33	1.37	1.0	0.9	2.2	1.2

TABLE V

RESPONSES TO INTERVIEW QUESTION TWO: WHAT DON'T YOU LIKE ABOUT THE SCHOOL YOUR CHILD ATTENDS?

Most Frequent Responses	Per Cent So Responding
Nazlini:	
No response.	53
The students and their clothing are not given proper care.	27
Many Farms (BIA):	
No response.	86
Poor care of children.	14
Many Farms (Public):	
They mistreat our children.	45
No response.	28
The distance to the school and the bussing problem in the winter.	22
They do not teach Navajo language and culture.	22
I have to pay for lunches, textbooks, etc.	11
Kayenta (Public):	
No response.	48
Our children are not well disciplined.	20
The distance to school and the problem of bussing in the winter.	16
The school dances and what occurs there.	14
Rough Rock:	
No response.	66
The school has gone too far into the sacred parts of Navajo culture.	10

TABLE V (continued)

Most Frequent Responses	Per Cent So Responding
Tempe:	
No response.	58
The staff is of poor quality generally.	16

TABLE VI

NUMBER OF NEGATIVE RESPONSES TO QUESTION TWO

	Naz-lini	Many Farms BIA	Many Farms Public	Kayenta	Rough Rock	Tempe
Number of parents questioned	30	22	18	50	58	45
Total number of negative responses	17	5	18	37	25	29
Number of negative responses per parent	0.57	0.23	1.0	0.74	0.43	0.64

BIA boarding schools and Rough Rock, which is also a local boarding school. The single, most frequent criticism was that of the bussing of children long distances in bad weather.

To get an overall positive-negative attitude gauge towards the schools on the part of parents, it is necessary to look at the ratio of positive responses to negative responses in Questions One and Two. Table VII compares the ratio of positive and negative responses in each group.

The figures above indicate that Rough Rock parents feel more positively about their school than any of the others. The BIA boarding school at Many Farms is in a strong second position, while the public school at Many Farms is in a solid last place. The recent occurrances in the Chinle Public School System, of which Many Farms is a part, verifies the figures presented here.*

In order to get a gauge of parental knowledge of the school program, it is possible to combine all responses and make a per parent tally. This would be valid because greater awareness of the school program should on the average produce more likes and dislikes concerning the school. A parent has to know something about the school before he or she can like or dislike anything. Therefore,

---

*In just a year after these interviews were done, a school board member was recalled and replaced, and the Superintendent and two principals were compelled to resign.

TABLE VII

COMPARISON OF POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ONE AND TWO

	Naz-lini	Many Farms BIA	Many Farms Public	Kayenta	Rough Rock	Tempe
Total number of parents interviewed	30	22	18	50	58	45
Total number of positive responses	40	30	18	45	128	54
Total number of negative responses	17	5	18	37	25	29
Ratio of positive and negative responses	+13	+25	0	+8	+103	+25
Ratio of positive and negative responses per parent	0.43	1.14	0	0.16	1.78	0.55

Table VIII should be a fairly good indicator of parental knowledge of the school program.

Table VIII indicates that Rough Rock parents know more about their school than the others, but there are so many other variables involved in these responses that this table alone is hardly conclusive. It will have to be considered together with all the other available data before any strong conclusions can be drawn.

The third question common to all interviews concerned the parents' knowledge of the existence of a local board of education. The results of this question are presented in Table IX.

A corollary question to Question Three asked parents to name the members of the board of education. The results are tabulated in Table X.

The questions above are simple but important. The board of education cannot be an important and representative institution of the public will if no one knows about it or who sits on it. The institution of the local board of education is the principal way in which the school community participates in and directs the major affairs and operation of the public schools in Arizona and throughout most of the country. Yet only 11 per cent of the parents at Many Farms, 14 per cent at Kayenta, and 19 per cent at Tempe knew a majority of the members of the board of education, and 39 per cent at Many Farms and 40 per cent at Kayenta did not even know a board of education existed.

TABLE VIII

PARENTAL KNOWLEDGE OF SCHOOL PROGRAM BASED ON POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ONE AND TWO

	Nazlini	Many Farms BIA	Many Farms Public	Kayenta	Rough Rock	Tempe
Number of parents interviewed	30	22	18	50	58	45
Total number of responses	57	35	36	82	153	83
Average number of responses per parent	1.9	1.6	2.0	1.6	2.6	1.8

TABLE IX

RESPONSES TO INTERVIEW QUESTION THREE: IS THERE A SCHOOL BOARD FOR THE SCHOOL YOUR CHILD ATTENDS?

Responses	Naz-lini	Many Farms BIA	Many Farms Public	Kayenta	Rough Rock	Tempe*
Yes	90%	0%	61%	42%	88%	
No	3	100	33	20	--	
I don't know	7	0	6	20	12	
I think so	0	0	0	18	--	

*Note: The parents at Tempe were asked a slightly different question: Which board of education controls the school your child attends?

Answers:

Tempe Elementary District Board No. 3	51%
Tempe Board	22
I don't know	27

TABLE X

RESPONSES TO COROLLARY QUESTION TO INTERVIEW QUESTION THREE: IF YES (TO PREVIOUS QUESTION), WHO IS ON THE BOARD?

Responses	Naz-lini	Many Farms BIA	Many Farms Public	Kayenta	Rough Rock	Tempe
Number of board members	5	0*	3	3	5	3
Answers:						
Knows none	10		44	26	7	56
Knows one	10		6	2	0	25
Knows two	30		11	8	2	13
Knows three	7			6	3	6
Knows four	26				21	
Knows five	7				55	

*Note: There is no board of education for the Many Farms Bureau of Indian Affairs school.

These figures indicate that in these three public school districts only a small number of parents at best are involved in or even aware of the decision-making process by the supposedly representative local boards of education. Thus, although the institutional apparatus exists, the local board of education and the public school is not, in these districts, the institution of the people it was designed to be.

The schools of the Bureau of Indian Affairs are not directed or controlled by the local people in the way that public schools are supposed to be controlled and directed. Many Bureau schools do not even have school boards, as exemplified by the situation at the Many Farms BIA school. Nevertheless, many BIA schools have local boards of education and some of these are very active, even though they have no official power. Nazlini is an example of a relatively active board of education. The principal there is a Navajo, and this facilitates community and school board participation in school affairs. Ninety per cent of the parents at Nazlini knew about the existence of a school board and forty per cent of the parents knew a majority of the members of the school board.

At Rough Rock 88 per cent of the parents knew of the existence of the school board and twelve per cent were not sure about it. Whereas only 11, 14, 19, and 40 per cent of the parents in the other school districts knew a majority of the members of the school board, at Rough Rock 79 per cent of the parents knew a majority of the members of the school board. Therefore, at least at Rough Rock and possibly at Nazlini, enough parents are aware of the school board and its members to form the basis of community control and direction of the school program. Whether in fact these schools are really institutions of the people requires more data, derived from additional questions and experiences.

Another matter of importance regarding parental knowledge of the school board is the extent to which parents are aware of the role and functions of the school board. Accordingly, the parents were asked Question Four. The responses are enumerated in Table XI.

The results of Question Four are very revealing. In all cases except Tempe and Rough Rock, the parents had little or no idea of the functions of school boards. At Rough Rock the parents show signs of an awareness of the functions of school boards, but their knowledge of the proper functions of a school board is inadequate. Only at Tempe do the parents show a substantial awareness of the proper functioning of a school board.

These results should not be surprising,considering that local boards of education are very new institutions among the Navajo and a very old institution among Anglo Americans. It is very much to the credit of the Rough Rock Demonstration School that it, in just two years, has accomplished substantially more in educating parents regarding

TABLE XI

RESPONSES TO INTERVIEW QUESTION FOUR: WHAT DOES THE SCHOOL BOARD DO?

Most Frequent Responses	Per Cent So Responding
Nazlini:	
I don't know.	54
They meet to discuss school matters.	33
Many Farms (BIA):	
(Not asked because there is no school board.)	
Many Farms (Public):	
I don't know.	44
They meet to discuss school matters.	17
Relates the school to the community.	11
Kayenta:	
I don't know.	34
Rough Rock:	
They meet to discuss school matters.	36
I don't know.	35
Hire and fire school staff.	33
Relates the school to the community.	22
Controls the operation of the school.	17
Tempe:	
Handles school finances and revenue.	58
Hires and fires school staff.	45
Sets school policies.	31
Has some responsibilities for the school curriculum.	27
Controls the operation of the school.	18
Sets teacher standards.	16

the functions of a school board than other schools where the local school board has existed much longer. Nevertheless, Rough Rock's accomplishment is inadequate and much more work needs to be done in this regard. For everyone, it should be clear that to establish a school board is one thing; toeducate the community on the role and functions of the school board is quite another. Much attention needs to be given to both where there is no properly functioning school board, and to the latter where there is a properly functioning school board.

Question Five deals with the parents' general approval or disapproval of the school board. With the exceptions of Rough Rock and Tempe, the reactions to this question are mixed and ambiguous. This is in line with the last question where these same parents indicated a lack of knowledge with regards to the functions of a school board. It would be inconsistent for parents to approve of school boards when they did not know what the school boards were doing. Only Rough Rock and Tempe show a strong approving attitude toward the school board.

The next question deals with how the parents felt about local control itself. This question and the responses to it are shown in Table XIII. In connection with Question Six, the parents were asked to give their reasons for their answers or responses. These reasons are tabulated in Table XIV.

The responses shown in Tables XIII and XIV indicate

TABLE XII

RESPONSES TO INTERVIEW QUESTION FIVE: ARE YOU SATISFIED WITH THE LOCAL SCHOOL BOARD?

Responses	Naz-lini	Many Farms BIA	Many Farms Public	Kayenta	Rough Rock	Tempe
Yes	27%		22%	6%	64%	60%
No	20		11	4	9	9
I don't know	43		11	15	9	11
No response	0		17	30	2	0
Yes and no	0		2	0	3	0
I think so	0		0	0	0	20

TABLE XIII

RESPONSES TO INTERVIEW QUESTION SIX: DO YOU FEEL IT IS GOOD FOR THE LOCAL PEOPLE TO HAVE CONTROL OVER THE SCHOOLS THEIR CHILDREN ATTEND?

Responses	Nazlini	Many Farms BIA	Many Farms Public	Kayenta	Rough Rock	Tempe
Yes	73%	50%	56%	92%	85%	31%
No	10	27	28	4	5	31
I don't know	17	5	11	2	10	0
They should do this together with school officials.	0	18	5	2	0	38

TABLE XIV

REASONS FOR RESPONSES TO INTERVIEW QUESTION SIX

Most Frequent Responses	Per Cent So Responding
Why?	
Nazlini:	
So we will know more about what is going on at the school.	27
Because we want to and it is our right.	20
It is our children who attend the school.	10
We are concerned about our children's education.	10
Many Farms (BIA):	
We can improve the school.	27
Because we want to and it is our right.	22
Many Farms (Public):	
We can improve the school.	28
Because we want to and it is our right.	22
So we will know more about what is going on at the school.	17
We are capable of running the school.	17
So we could teach our children our own language and culture.	11
Kayenta:	
We can improve the school	22
It is our children who attend the school.	18
Rough Rock:	
We can improve the school.	28
It is our children who attend the school.	21
The students respond better to the school.	12
Because we want to and it is our right.	10

TABLE XIV (continued)

Most Frequent Responses	Per Cent So Responding
Tempe:	
We have a school board for this.	18
Why not?	
Nazlini:	
We are not qualified for this.	10
Many Farms (BIA):	
The school is going well as it is.	14
Many Farms (Public):	
The school is going well as it is.	
Kayenta:	
(No answers above ten per cent because only 4% answered no.)	
Rough Rock:	
(No answers above ten per cent because only 5% answered no.)	
Tempe:	
We are not qualified for that.	25

without any doubt that Navajos do want locally controlled schools. Seventy-eight per cent of all Navajo parents questioned responded "yes" to the question above. The responses also indicate a great amount of confidence in their ability to control and direct their own schools. If the history of Navajo education is to teach us anything, it should remind us that, even though Navajos indicate a strong desire to control their own schools, Navajo parents might reject locally controlled schools if they were imposed upon them without their consent or approval.

The responses of the Tempe group indicate a misunderstanding of the question. The question meant local control as it ideally exists in most public schools. Many of the parents thought the question meant local control to a much greater degree than through a representative board of education. They were probably confusing policy-making and administration.

Question Seven is concerned with parent-teacher relations. The question attempts to determine how many parents are acquainted with the teachers of their children, where they met, and whether the parents would like to meet the teachers if they have not.

The results of this question, shown in Table XV, indicate that the strongest parent-teacher relations are at Tempe. This is rather natural because at Tempe the parents and teachers share a similar cultural, social, racial and

TABLE XV

RESPONSES TO INTERVIEW QUESTION SEVEN: DO YOU KNOW YOUR CHILD'S TEACHER?

Responses	Naz-lini	Many Farms BIA	Many Farms Public	Kayenta	Rough Rock	Tempe
Yes	17%	5%	6%	40%	59%	93%
No	83	95	94	60	41	7
If yes, where did you meet?						
At the school	17	5	6	18	35	49
At my home				20	24	
At parent-teacher conference						11
School Open House						29
At church				2		4
If no, would you like to get acquainted with your child's teacher?						
Yes	83	95	72	56	33	7
No			22			
I don't know				4	8	

linguistic background. Among Navajos there is usually a large cultural, social, racial, and linguistic gulf between parents and teachers. This gulf, rather than lending justification for the lower number of parent-teacher acquaintances, points to a greater need for more parent-teacher cooperation and communication. In any case, the fact that 93 per cent of the parents at Tempe know their child's teacher is impressive and very commendable. It is not likely that that figure could be matched by many sub-urban schools. The reason for this high figure, as will soon be pointed out, is the many scheduled parent-teacher conferences at the schools in Tempe.

Among the Navajo parents, only those at Kayenta and Rough Rock showed a substantial number of acquaintances between parents and teachers. At Rough Rock 24 per cent of the parents met their child's teacher during a visit to the home by the teacher. The public school at Kayenta has also instigated a home visiting program on the part of teachers, and 20 per cent of the Kayenta parents said they met their child's teacher during a home visit. In the communities where there were no home visits by teachers, few parents knew their child's teacher. This indicates that it is necessary for the school to lead out in improving parent-teacher relations in Navajo schools and communities.

Question Eight is concerned with visits to the classroom by parents. First, the question tries to determine

TABLE XVI

RESPONSES TO INTERVIEW QUESTION EIGHT: DID YOU KNOW YOU ARE ENCOURAGED TO VISIT YOUR CHILD'S CLASSROOM?

Responses	Naz-lini	Many Farms BIA	Many Farms Public	Kayenta	Rough Rock	Tempe
Yes	40%	41%	44%	66%	65%	*
No	60	59	56	34	35	
If yes, have you done so?						
Yes	30	14	6	40	45	*
No	10	27	38	26	20	

*The Tempe parents were asked the following question: Have you attended a parent-teacher conference during the last year?

Yes	84%
No	16

if parents feel they are welcome in the classroom; and secondly, if they are welcome, how many have actually made such a visit.

The results above are again very revealing. The parent-teacher conferences at Tempe are the reason that so many parents are acquainted with their child's teacher. The parents at both Kayenta and Rough Rock feel more welcome to visit the school classrooms, and, accordingly, more of them have made such visits. This also relates back to the previous question which showed that teachers from these two schools had made more visits to the homes of the parents. Home visits by the teacher thus seem to make the parent feel more welcome at the school and encourage parents to visit the school. Again, this points to home visits as the beginning of better parent-teacher relations in Navajo education, and both Rough Rock and the Monument Valley Public Schools at Kayenta are to be commended in this regard.

Question Nine concerns what the parents know about the school curriculum.

The responses listed in Table XVII illustrate the typical Navajo view of schooling. It is a process by which students learn to speak, read, and write English and to count and manipulate numbers. The Navajo name for school, "ólta'," means the place where reading and counting takes place. Only at Rough Rock do parents see the school as substantially breaking this tradition by the teaching of Navajo language and culture.

TABLE XVII

RESPONSES TO INTERVIEW QUESTION NINE: WHAT DO YOUR CHILDREN LEARN AT SCHOOL?

Most Frequent Responses	Per Cent So Responding
Nazlini:	
I don't know	50
Reading and writing	40
English	13
Arithmetic	10
Art	10
Many Farms (BIA):	
I don't know	59
Reading and writing	32
Many Farms (Public):	
I don't know	50
Reading and writing	44
Social skills	11
Kayenta:	
I don't know	44
Reading and writing	32
English	26
Sports and physical education	12
Vocational skills	10
Rough Rock:	
Navajo culture and language	50
Reading and writing	33
I don't know	31
Core academic subjects	26
English	21

TABLE XVII (continued)

Most Frequent Responses	Per Cent So Responding
Tempe:	
Core academic subjects	85
Social skills	40
Good citizenship	20

The parents at Tempe show the broadest and most intensive knowledge of the school curriculum. This is true because all of them have had many years of schooling, whereas most of the Navajo parents have not had the opportunity of schooling. The responses of less than ten per cent (not listed above) designating various individual subject areas indicate that the Navajo parents at Rough Rock and Kayenta are the best informed with regard to the school curriculum.

In all the Navajo groups, the "I don't know" responses are much too numerous. These parents really know that their children are learning to read, write and speak English and probably to count. What they are really saying is that the school, white man's education, and their children are so far removed from them that they just feel ignorant or unsure of what it is all about. This means that the content and purposes of schooling have never been communicated to these parents in a way that they can fully understand and accept it. It is significant that Rough Rock has the fewest number of "I don't know" responses, but even at Rough Rock there is much room for improvement.

The message to educators from Navajo parents in response to Question Ten is very clear. The responses are provided in Table XVIII.

Navajo parents view education with one central hope in mind: better jobs and a higher standard of living for

TABLE XVIII

RESPONSES TO INTERVIEW QUESTION TEN: WHAT SHOULD YOUR CHILDREN LEARN IN SCHOOL THAT THEY ARE NOT NOW LEARNING?

Most Frequent Responses	Per Cent So Responding
Nazlini:	
Vocational skills	40
Navajo language and culture	27
I don't know	13
Many Farms (BIA):	
I don't know	64
Vocational skills	27
Social skills	14
Many Farms (Public):	
I don't know	50
Vocational skills	28
Navajo language and culture	17
Kayenta:	
Vocational skills	74
I don't know	26
More art	10
Rough Rock:	
I don't know	73
Vocational skills	27
Tempe:	
I don't know	47
Sex education	11

their children. In the first forty interviews done, the parents were asked why they send their children to school. Of these first forty parents interviewed, thirty-five or eighty-eight per cent, said they sent their children to school in order for them to get tood jobs when they get older. This is a very pragmatic view of schooling, but one which is valid and one which ought to be followed more closely. One of the first major changes in the curriculum at Rough Rock that came completely on the initiative of the local school board was the addition of various programs and classes in vocational areas. It is also clear that Navajo parents want vocational training to begin, not in junior or senior high school, but in elementary school because the schools involved in the study are elementary schools. Many of theparents pointed with frustration and disappointment to high school graduates without skills with which to gain employment.

Question Eleven concerns instruction in Navajo culture at the school. No other question in the entire interview found as much agreementamong the parents as this question did. The responses shown in Table XIX make it clear that the idea of teaching Navajo culture at the school is a popular one. The parents were also able to give very good reasons for wanting thisin the curriculum. The main reasons listed by the parents were (1) to understand and appreciate their heritage, (2) to know and be proud of who they are, (3) to get along better among their own people, and

TABLE XIX

RESPONSES TO INTERVIEW QUESTION ELEVEN: DO YOU THINK YOUR CHILDREN SHOULD LEARN ABOUT THE NAVAJO WAY OF LIFE AT SCHOOL?

Responses	Naz-lini	Many Farms BIA	Many Farms Public	Kayenta	Rough Rock	Tempe*
Yes	100%	100%	100%	90%	100%	85%
No	0	0	0	8	0	11
Not sure	0	0	0	2	0	4

*Tempe parents were asked a slightly different question: Do you think schools for Indians, Spanish Americans, and Negros should teach these children about their own culture, language, and history?

(4) it is essential for them to know both cultures.

Question Twelve is a companion question to Question Eleven. It concerns Navajo language instruction instead of Navajo culture. Again the response, as shown in Table XX, is strongly positive for the addition of Navajo-related items into the school program. It should be remembered, however, that many Navajo parents rejected this when it was imposed upon them in limited degrees. It is likely many and maybe most Navajos would again reject this if it were not done under their direction and control. Thus it is my opinion that instruction in Navajo language and culture can only be successful when it is developed and done within the framework of local control.

The last question asked all six groups of parents concerns the local school administration. The responses, listed in table XXI, indicate that Bryon Tsinnijinnie (a Navajo) at Nazlini and Bob Roessel at Rough Rock were the best known in the communities served by the various schools. In all the other cases except Tempe, less than half the persons knew the principal of the school. Such ignorance of the school principal indicates a lack of exchange, interchange, and cooperation between the schools and the communities served by them.

A corollary question asked those parents who knew the principal was to rate the performance of the principal. The responses shown in table XXII indicate that only the principal at Rough Rock is rated clearly positive by a large

TABLE XX

RESPONSES TO INTERVIEW QUESTION TWELVE: WOULD YOU LIKE YOUR CHILD TO LEARN TO READ AND WRITE THE NAVAJO LANGUAGE?

Responses	Naz-lini	Many Farms BIA	Many Farms Public	Kayenta	Rough Rock	Tempe
Yes	100%	100%	94%	98%	85%	Not asked
No	0	0	6	2	5	
No response	0	0	0	0	10	

TABLE XXI

RESPONSES TO INTERVIEW QUESTION THIRTEEN: WHO IS THE PRINCIPAL (OR HEAD) OF THE SCHOOL YOUR CHILD ATTENDS?

Responses	Naz-lini	Many Farms BIA	Many Farms Public	Kayenta	Rough Rock	Tempe
Named correct person	70%	46%	23%	44%	79%	58%
Named incorrect person	0	0	11	0	0	0
Did not know	30	54	66	56	21	42

TABLE XXII

RESPONSES RATING PERFORMANCE OF PRINCIPAL: IS HE DOING A GOOD JOB?

Responses	Naz-lini	Many Farms BIA	Many Farms Public	Kayenta	Rough Rock	Tempe
Yes	30	27	16	24	72	25
No	13	0	6	6	0	4
I don't know	17	0	6	14	7	0
I think so	10	19	6	0	0	18
Could be better	0	0	0	0	0	2
He is trying hard	0	0	0	0	0	9

majority of the local parents. All the others are around the twenty-five per cent mark. This indicates that the principal or head of the school at Rough Rock at the time of the interviews (Bob Roessel) made a strong effort to relate the school program to the local people and to get their approval and direction.

Along with the thirteen questions and responses already discussed, there were a number of other questions asked to only part of the parents. These questions were added for various reasons. Many were either added too late to be asked of some groups or were only appropriate for some of the groups. Some questions were added by local school officials for their own interest and not designed for comparative purposes.

Several questions concerned the attitude of parents toward dormitories and their operation. The parents at Nazlini and Kayenta were asked whether they preferred a dormitory school or a public day school. The responses to this question are hardly conclusive. They typify the confusion about Navajo attitudes toward dormitories. At Kayenta, where theparents were sending their children to public school, only 20 per cent of the parents preferred dormitories. At Nazlini, which is a boarding school, 97 per cent of the parents preferred dormitories. In understanding these conflicting responses, it must be remembered that the parents interviewed at Kayenta live within a mile of a good or paved road, while those at Nazlini do not live

TABLE XXIII

RESPONSES TO ADDED QUESTION A: WOULD YOU RATHER HAVE YOUR CHILDREN ATTEND A DAY SCHOOL OR LIVE IN A DORMITORY?

Responses	Nazlini	Kayenta
Day school	0%	52%
Dormitory	97	20
No preference	3	28

near good roads. In addition, the parents at Kayenta generally have a little more education and money than those at Nazlini.

It probably could be said that Navajo parents prefer day schools when the roads permit the successful operation of busses, have enough money to feed their children through the winter and to pay for textbooks, lunches and other fees, and are given the chance to make the choice themselves. It is likely that poorer Navajo families would prefer public schools if they were given some kind of assistance in handling the extra burden on their budget. Thus Navajo parents prefer either day or boarding schools depending on the situation in which they find themselves.

Parents at Nazlini, Many Farms (Boarding), and Rough Rock were asked if they liked the idea of parents working in the dormitories on a rotation basis. The responses, shown in Table XXIV, are consistent and conclusive, except for the Many Farms group. The reasons parents at Many Farms mentioned for rejecting this idea was that (1) the students would not obey them, (2) they were not qualified, (3) it would create conflicts with the school staff, and (4) the BIA doesn't need our help. This sounds like the BIA has convinced these parents that they are, in fact, an obstacle in the education of their children, not a contributor. This was the song and jargon of the BIA for many years, and it seems some Navajo parents were convinced.

TABLE XXIV

RESPONSES TO ADDED QUESTION B: DO YOU THINK IT IS GOOD FOR PARENTS TO WORK IN THE DORMITORY ON A ROTATION BASIS?

Responses	Nazlini*	Many Farms BIA*	Rough Rock
Yes	94%	36%	90%
No	3	55	5
I don't know	3	9	5

*Note: The question asked at Nazlini and Many Farms was: Do you think it would be good for parents to work in the dormitory on a rotation basis?

A third question concerning the dormitory operation asked the parents about how they felt about their children coming home every weekend. It will be remembered that in the past nearly all Navajo children never came home during the school year without running away from school. In recent years, schools within fifty miles of the homes of the children have let them go home more often. This question concerns weekend visits by children attending schools in their home community.

The answers, shown in Table XXV, indicate clearly that Navajos want the opportunity to have their children at home every weekend. It is hoped that schools not following this policy will soon do so. After all, the children belong to their parents, not to the school.

The parents at Kayenta were asked to identify the differences between public schools and BIA schools. The responses to this question are listed in their entirety in Table XXVI.

These responses show a preference for the public school, but it must be remembered that the parents interviewed have their children in the public school and thus are likely to have a tendency to prefer it. About one-fourth of the parents could not identify any important differences, but the majority were able to perceive many important and accurate differences.

The parents at Rough Rock were asked to identify differences between the demonstration school and other schools.

TABLE XXV

RESPONSES TO ADDED QUESTION C: IS IT GOOD FOR YOUR CHILDREN TO COME HOME ON THE WEEKENDS?

Responses	Nazlini	Many Farms BIA	Rough Rock
Yes	94%	82%	95%
No	0	18	5
Best every two weeks	3	0	0
Sometimes	3	0	0

TABLE XXVI

RESPONSES TO ADDED QUESTION D: HOW IS THE PUBLIC SCHOOL AT KAYENTA DIFFERENT FROM BIA SCHOOLS?

Responses	Per Cent So Responding
Public schools bus the children daily.	20%
The public school has better methods of instruction.	16
There is little difference.	14
The public school students learn at home as well as at school.	12
I don't know.	12
BIA has better discipline.	8
Public school is more cosmopolitan.	4
Public school students have to pay for their books, lunches, etc.	4
Children learn more at public school.	2
They have different policies.	2
Public school goes to higher grades.	2
BIA has better instruction.	2
Promotion in BIA schools is continuous.	2
BIA schools have existed longer.	2

All the responses to this question are provided in Table XVII. These answers strongly indicate that the parents at Rough Rock are pretty well aware of how the school is different from other schools. The responses to both this question and the preceding one show that Navajo parents are aware of the different kinds of schools serving them, and are well prepared to make intelligent choices concerning educational approaches and school programs if given the opportunity.

The final question* of the kind presented in this second group concerns the preference of the parents at Rough Rock for a continuation of the demonstration school or a return to BIA control. The results are shown in Table XXVIII.

The parents were also asked to give their reasons for their preferences, shown in Table XXIX. These responses speak for themselves. The Rough Rock parents want the demonstration school to continue for the many reasons listed in Table XXIX.

A summary and the overall conclusions to be drawn from this data will not be presented here, but will be left for the final chapter. The next chapter will relate andcompare other research done at Rough Rock and elsewhere with the data obtained in this study. The

---

*There were several other questions of this kind, but they are left out here either because they did not prove to be good questions or the responses were insignificant.

TABLE XVII

RESPONSES TO ADDED QUESTION E: HOW IS THE DEMONSTRATION SCHOOL DIFFERENT FROM BIA AND PUBLIC SCHOOLS?

Responses	Per Cent So Responding
Instruction in Navajo language and culture.	71%
The school sponsors an arts and crafts program.	45
The school is locally controlled through a board of education.	38
The demonstration school has a rotating dorm parent program.	29
The school employs local uneducated Navajos.	22
Children are permitted to go home every weekend.	17
I don't know.	7
Children seem to be more at ease at the school.	3
Parents are encouraged to visit, eat, and stay at the school.	3
There is no difference.	3
The school sponsors community activities and dinners.	2
The children have too many privileges and are poorly disciplined.	2

TABLE XVII (continued)

Responses	Per Cent So Responding
Horses are available for students at the school.	2%
Navajo supervisors	2
Different educational techniques.	2

TABLE XXVIII

RESPONSES TO ADDED QUESTION F: WOULD YOU PREFER TO HAVE THE DEMONSTRATION SCHOOL CONTINUE AT ROUGH ROCK OR WOULD YOU RATHER HAVE A BIA SCHOOL AT ROUGH ROCK?

Responses	Per Cent So Responding
Prefer Rough Rock Demonstration School	87%
Prefer BIA school	3
Like both	7
I don't know	3

TABLE XXIX

REASONS FOR ANSWERS TO ADDED QUESTION F: WHY DO YOU PREFER THE ROUGH ROCK DEMONSTRATION SCHOOL?

Responses	Per Cent So Responding
The school teaches the Navajo language and culture.	40
This is a Navajo school which belongs to us and tries to serve us.	36
A BIA school would separate itself from the community and lure the interests of the children away from their homes.	28
The uneducated would lose their jobs under BIA control.	24
The demonstration school is better and the children learn more.	29
We would lose the arts and crafts program under the BIA.	24
If the school continues to go well, why stop it?	7
Children can come home every weekend.	3
My children enjoy attending the demonstration school.	2

emphasis will be on the differences and similarities of the findings of other researchers. The summary chapter will follow the discussion of related research.

CHAPTER V

RELATED RESEARCH

There have been two other major studies and numerous minor studies and observations conducted at Rough Rock during its first three years of operation (1966-1969). One of the major studies was done by Donald Erickson and Henrietta Schwartz of the University of Chicago.[60] The other major study was done by John Y. Begay, Samuel Billison, Herbert Blatchford, Sr., and Henry D. Gatewood, II.[61] These two studies greatly contrast with each other; and, therefore, provide interesting comparisons with the research presented in this thesis.

Donald Erickson and Henrietta Schwartz were both non-Navajos who had little or no acquaintance with Navajos or Navajo culture before beginning their study. By contrast, the other team of four researchers were all Navajos and highly familiar with Navajo culture and the problems of Navajo education. The interests of the Chicago team in

---

[60] Donald A. Erickson and Henrietta Schwartz, "Community School at Rough Rock, An Evaluation for the Office of Economic Opportunity" (Chicago: Mimeographed by authors, April, 1969).

[61] Samuel W. Billison, John Y. Begay, Herbert Blatchford, Sr., and Henry D. Gatewood, II, "Navajo Evaluators Look at the Rough Rock Demonstration School" (Rough Rock, Arizona: Rough Rock Demonstration School, June 1, 1969).

Navajo education were, however sincere, limited and transitory, while the four Navajos have worked for better education for Navajos for many years and their future lies in the same venture.

The Chicago team was authorized and funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity, a major funding agency of the Rough Rock Demonstration School. The Navajo team was authorized and funded by the Rough Rock school itself. The Chicago team had over $50,000 for their study and took nearly a year to complete it. The Navajo team had less than a thousand dollars and completed their study in less than a month.

The Chicago team attempted to meet as many of the requirements for "scientific" and "objective" research as possible,[62] while the Navajo team took a more humanistic approach to their study.[63] It was claimed that the more humanistic study done by the Navajos was closer to the Navajo way of doing things.

The Navajo team talked to and interviewed everyone in the language they understood, and they conducted all their interviews themselves. The director and assistant director of the Chicago team spent most of their time talking to non-Navajos and a few Navajos who could speak English fairly well. They hired Navajos to interview the Navajos and to report to them in English what the Navajos said in the interviews. In terms of language, race, and culture, the Navajo team were in a much better position to communicate with the people concerned. Conversely, the Chicago team had a time advantage: that is, they spent more time at the school and with the people. Whether one advantage offsets the other is open to speculation. There are many other contrasts in the two studies but these are probably the most important and illustrate the major trends and emphases of each study.

---

[62] Erickson and Schwartz, op. cit., pp. 1.1-1.15.

[63] Billison et. al., op. cit., p. 21.

Both the Chicago team and the Navajo team attempted to evaluate the entire operation at Rough Rock. Because the study here focused only on community-school relations as evidenced by interviews with parents, only the findings with regard to community-school relations of the other two studies will be considered. The study by the Chicago team more closely resembles in design the research reported in this thesis, and the discussion here will begin with a comparison of the research of the Chicago team and that reported in the preceding chapter.

The Chicago team employed Navajos to interview parents at Rough Rock and parents of children attending three other schools. Of the thirteen questions used in all the 223 interviews previously reported, seven were used by the Chicago team. In addition, four of the corollary questions were used in both studies. Because both studies have been and will continue to be accused of bias, these questions common to both studies would seem to provide a good check or means of reliability cross-validation. Such cross-validation checks can be done with the parents at Rough Rock, but not so well at the other places.

The Chicago team was furnished with a list of those parents at Rough Rock who had been interviewed in the study reported here (henceforth, the Witherspoon study). The Chicago team randomly selected pupils for their study and decided to interview the parents, who had not been interviewed previously, of the randomly selected pupils. This gave them thirty-one parent couples to be interviewed.[64] This number is roughly comparable to the twenty-eight interviewed in the first group of interviews at Rough Rock in the winter of 1966-67 and the 30 interviewed in the summer of 1967. The eighty-five parents interviewed represents nearly two-thirds of the parent couples sending children to the Rough Rock school. On this basis, there is no reason to suspect that the two studies should have obtained significantly different responses to the same questions.

Outside of Rough Rock the possibilities of comparison and cross-validation become more difficult. The Witherspoon study conducted interviews at Nazlini, Many Farms, and Kayenta. The Chicago study conducted interviews at Rock Point, Chinle, and areas surrounding Chinle.[65] The schools in the Witherspoon study were the local BIA boarding school at Nazlini, the public school at Many Farms, the BIA school at Many Farms, and the public school at Kayenta. The Chicago study included the BIA schools at Chinle and Rock Point and the public school at Chinle.[66]

---

[64] Erickson and Schwartz, op. cit., pp. 1.9-10.

[65] Ibid., p. 3.9.

The interviews at Rock Point should be roughly comparable to the interviews at Nazlini. Both are local BIA boarding schools of long existence and with principals oriented to positive community-school relations. Both schools have relatively active education committees or school boards. However, the Navajo principal at Nazlini had only been on the job one year as compared to seven years for the principal at Rock Point. In addition, the Rock Point school is a much more special school in the BIA system than is the school at Nazlini.[67] As such, the Rock Point school is more comparable to Rough Rock than Nazlini. In any case, both Rock Point and Nazlini* represent the cream of the crop in terms of community-school relations in BIA education.

Added to the fact that the schools at Rock Point and Nazlini are not truly comparable is the fact that the parents interviewed at Rock Point do not represent a good random sample. Because of bad weather conditions, the Chicago team was only able to interview seventeen of the twenty-eight parents in their random sample.[68] The ones they missed lived in places more difficult to reach and for that reason would have likely been less involved in and knowledgeable about the school. All of these reasons suggest that the responses at Rock Point might not truly represent the situation at Rock Point and certainly would not necessarily be expected to be comparable to the responses at Nazlini or Rough Rock.

---

[66] _Ibid._, p. 3.10.

[67] _Ibid._, p. 1.7.

*It might be pointed out here that the school at Nazlini was selected by Bureau officials at Chinle for the Witherspoon study.

The interviews done by the Chicago team at Chinle with parents sending their children to the public school are most closely comparable to the interviews of the Witherspoon study with parents of public school students in the Many Farms and Kayenta areas. Even though the Chinle and Many Farms areas and communities are different, they are adjacent and their schools belong to the same school system. This school system has been noted for its problems in community-school relations.[69] Therefore, the responses of the Many Farms parents should be closer to the Chinle responses than those of the Kayenta parents.

The problem in comparing the responses of parents of public school children at Many Farms and Chinle is again one of sampling. The Chicago study made a specific attempt to exclude the more acculturated parents,[70] while the Witherspoon study made no such attempt. The sampling in the Witherspoon study at Many Farms was not as precise as it was in the other areas and a smaller number (18) of parents were interviewed. The Chicago team only interviewed nine parents of Chinle Public School students,[71] and that is an extremely small sample of students from such an enormous school system. Therefore, neither the Witherspoon interviews nor the Chicago interviews could claim to truly represent parent opinion in the Chinle Public School District and cannot necessarily be expected to be similar to each other.

---

[68] Ibid., p. 3.10.

[69] Ibid., p. 3.1-6.

[70] Ibid., p. 1.11.

The interviews by the Chicago team of parents of children attending the Chinle Board School should be roughly comparable to those of parents of students at the Many Farms Boarding School conducted by the Witherspoon study. The two schools are both large boarding schools drawing students from distant as well as nearby points. The Chicago team excluded all parents from the local Chinle area and focused on parents from the more distant points.[72] The Witherspoon study interviewed only parents living in the Many Farms area and excluded the parents living at more distant points. Added to this problem is the fact that the Chicago team was only able to interview eleven of the twenty-eight parents in their sample for the Chinle Boarding School.[73]

---

[71] Ibid., p. 3.10.

[72] Ibid., p. 1.10.

[73] Ibid., p. 3.10.

This information indicates that the only truly comparable results for the purposes of cross-validation between the Chicago study and the Witherspoon study are those from the Rough Rock area. At Rough Rock, the sampling was random and sufficient. The Chicago study was a year to two years later, but, in most other ways, it was similar to the Witherspoon study. Therefore, where the questions were similar the responses should be somewhat similar. With this rather lengthy introduction, a comparison of the actual responses to similar questions will follow.

The first question in the Witherspoon study was one of those used in the Chicago study. The results of each are compared in Table XXX with the schools which should be relatively comparable.

The Chicago study only used the first response of the parents and ignored the rest of the responses. The Witherspoon study utilized all responses. This explains why there is substantial agreement on the most frequent responses and why there are more responses from the Witherspoon groups. Considering this factor, the responses are strongly similar with the exception of the Rock Point group emphasizing good education and the Nazlini group emphasizing good care.

The second question of the Witherspoon study and a companion to the first was also used by the Chicago study. The results of both are compared in Table XXXI.

TABLE XXX

RESPONSES TO INTERVIEW QUESTION ONE COMPARED TO RESULTS OF CHICAGO STUDY:* WHAT DO YOU LIKE ABOUT THE SCHOOL YOUR CHILD ATTENDS?

Responses	Per Cent So Responding	
	Chicago Study[74]	Witherspoon Study
	Rough Rock	Rough Rock
Instruction in both cultures and languages	67	60
Arts and crafts program	0	35
Community programs	0	31
Employment for local people	7	31
Local control	4	12
Good education in general	11	9
No response or criticism	7	5
	Rock Point	Nazlini
Good education in general	71	13
Good care for children	6	57
School is close to home	0	47
Learning both English and Navajo	12	0

---

[74] *Ibid.*, p. 3.38.

*The reader may note that categories of answers essentially the same in both studies but under different titles (such as "child is taught how to behave" and "good discipline") have been categorized together under the simplest, shortest title. Also, the per centage points in the Chicago study have been rounded off to the closest whole. The responses in the Witherspoon study shown here sometimes include some responses (under ten per cent ones) which were not presented earlier. This is in accordance with the attempt at comparison. All responses of over ten per cent in one study or the other are listed.

TABLE XXX (continued)

Responses	Per Cent So Responding		
	Chicago Study	Witherspoon Study	
	Chinle BIA	Many Farms BIA	
Good education in general	64	64	
Good care for children	18	32	
Good discipline	9	23	
Children like the school	0	18	
	Chinle Public	Many Farms Public	Kayenta Public
Good education in general	44	39	38
Good care for children	11	0	4
Good teachers	0	17	2
Children like the school	0	22	2
Comments not clearly positive or negative	44	11	16
Good administration	0	0	20

TABLE XXXI

RESPONSES TO INTERVIEW QUESTION TWO COMPARED WITH THE RESULTS OF THE CHICAGO STUDY: WHAT DON'T YOU LIKE ABOUT THE SCHOOL YOUR CHILD ATTENDS?

Responses	Per Cent So Responding	
	Chicago Study[75]	Witherspoon Study
	Rough Rock	Rough Rock
No complaint	52	66
Poor care of children*	22	8
Content of teaching	7	10
	Rock Point	Nazlini
No complaint	53	53
Poor care of children	35	27
	Chinle BIA	Many Farms BIA
No complaint	64	86
Poor care of children	18	14
Lack of communication between school and parent	18	0

---

[75] *Ibid.*, p. 3.35.

*Poor care of children can mean anything from poor discipline to lack of health care or mistreatment of the children.

TABLE XXXI (continued)

Responses	Per Cent So Responding		
	Chicago Study	Witherspoon Study	
	Chinle Public	Many Farms Public	Kayenta Public
No complaint	78	28	48
Poor care of children	22	44	36
Bussing in the winter	0	22	16
They do not teach Navajo language and culture	0	22	0

Again these results are very similar in the most frequent responses. The only group of parents who really complained were the Many Farms parents who send their children to the public school. Most of these complaints concerned the mistreatment of children. It is well-known that such complaints existed in the Chinle Public School District. For some reason, the Chicago study did not draw out these complaints, but they only interviewed nine parents in this group. In any case, the overall results continue to show a high degree of similarity.

Question Three of the Witherspoon study was also used in the Chicago study. The responses to this question in the two studies are compared in Table XXXII. These results are so similar it is hard to believe. The similarity is probably due to the fact that this is a simple, factual question, drawing mostly "yes" and "no" answers. The corollary question to Question Three is listed in Table XXXIII.

The responses in Table XXXIII are again very similar for this simple, factual question. The Chicago study shows the Rough Rock parents to be better informed with regard to the school board than does the Witherspoon study. This slight difference is probably due to the timing factor. In both cases, Rough Rock parents are shown to be much better informed with regard to the school board than any of the others. This is strong evidence to support the view that the Rough Rock board is a more important

TABLE XXXII

RESPONSES TO INTERVIEW QUESTION THREE COMPARED WITH THE RESULTS OF THE CHICAGO STUDY: DOES THE SCHOOL YOUR CHILD ATTENDS HAVE A SCHOOL BOARD (OR EDUCATION COMMITTEE)?

Responses	Per Cent So Responding		
	Chicago Study[76]	Witherspoon Study	
	Rough Rock	Rough Rock	
Yes	100	88	
No	0	0	
I don't know	0	12	
	Rock Point	Nazlini	
Yes	88	90	
No	12	3	
I don't know	0	7	
	Chinle Public	Many Farms Public	Kayenta Public
Yes (or I think so)	56	61	60
No	33	33	20
No answer	11	0	0
I don't know	0	6	20

---

[76] *Ibid.*, p. 3.31.

TABLE XXXIII

RESPONSES TO COROLLARY QUESTION TO INTERVIEW QUESTION THREE COMPARED TO THE RESULTS OF THE CHICAGO STUDY: WHO IS ON THE BOARD?*

Responses	Per Cent So Responding		
	Chicago Study[77]	Witherspoon Study	
	Rough Rock	Rough Rock	
Knows none	4	19	
Knows one	4	0	
Knows two	7	2	
Knows three or more	85	79	
	Rock Point	Nazlini	
Knows none	18	20	
Knows one	6	10	
Knows two	47	30	
Knows three or more	18	40	
No answer	12	0	
	Chenle Public	Many Farms Public	Kay-enta Public
Knows none	33	83	84
Knows one	22	6	2
Knows two	11	11	8
Knows three or more	0	0	6
No answer	33	0	0

---

[77] *Ibid.*

*The Chicago study put this question slightly different: Please name as many school board members as you can think of.

and stronger force in the community and the school than any of the other boards.

Another question common to both studies concerned how well the parents knew the teachers of their children. The figures in Table XXXIV are consistent with what is known about the schools and their programs. A dorm parent program and/or a teacher home visit program will greatly increase the per centage of parents who know the teachers of their children. Both Rough Rock and Rock Point have dorm parent programs, although Rock Point's has not been as continuous and extensive as that of Rough Rock. The public school at Kayenta and Rough Rock have both had their teachers make home visits. It is, therefore, not surprising that these schools should rank well above the others on this scale.

On the basis of having parents work both in the dorms and in the classrooms and having teachers visit the homes of parents, it is surprising that Rough Rock's per centage is only 41 in the Chicago study. Other than error in the research process, the only explanation possible is that the transient nature of teachers at Rough Rock and the many changes in classroom organization and team teaching operations make the identity of a child's teacher rather obscure or unclear to parents.

A corollary question to the above concerns teacher visits to the homes of their pupils. The responses to this question are compared in Table XXXV.

TABLE XXXIV

RESPONSES TO INTERVIEW QUESTION SEVEN COMPARED TO THE RESULTS OF THE CHICAGO STUDY: DO YOU KNOW YOUR CHILD'S TEACHER?

Responses	Per Cent So Responding Chicago Study[78]	 Witherspoon Study	
	Rough Rock	Rough Rock	
Yes	41	59	
No	56	41	
Other	4	0	
	Rock Point	Nazlini	
Yes	59	17	
No	29	83	
Other	12	0	
	Chinle BIA	Many Farms BIA	
Yes	9	5	
No	82	95	
Other	9	0	
	Chinle Public	Many Farms Public	Kayenta Public
Yes	11	6	40
No	78	94	60
Other	11	0	0

[78] *Ibid.*, p. 3.32.

TABLE XXXV

RESPONSES TO COROLLARY QUESTION TO INTERVIEW QUESTION SEVEN COMPARED WITH THE RESULTS OF THE CHICAGO STUDY: HAS YOUR CHILD'S TEACHER VISITED YOU AT HOME?

Responses	Per Cent So Responding		
	Chicago Study[79]	Witherspoon Study	
	Rough Rock	Rough Rock	
Yes	33	35	
No	67	65	
	Rock Point	Nazlini	
Yes	35	0	
No	65	100	
	Chinle BIA	Many Farms BIA	
Yes	9	5	
No	91	95	
	Chinle Public	Many Farms Public	Kayenta Public
Yes	11	0	20
No	89	100	80

---

[79] *Ibid.*, p. 3.33.

The figures in Table XXV are consistent and comparable with what is known about each school. The only figure that might be questioned is the figure that 35 per cent of theparents at Rock Point had been visited at home by their child's teacher. Even allowing for the fact that those interviewed at Rock Point lived in the most accessible areas, it is hard to believe that the teachers have been that active on their own in visiting homes. As far as this writer is aware, there is no organized program of teacher home visits at Rock Point. If there is, that would explain this high figure. Otherwise, the figures seem to be accurate and cross-validate each other.

The eighth question used in the Witherspoon study was also used in the Chicago study. This question concerns parent visits to the classrooms; the answers are compared in Table XXXVI.

The responses to this question are the most likely to be in error of the entire set for both studies. There is no specific word in Navajo for classroom and the interviewer had to make a special effort to explain what he meant. It is likely that the interviewers often just asked, "Lądiish 'óltą goné'é yaa 'úníyá?" which means "Have you ever gone inside the school?" It is also possible that some parents just answered "yes" without paying close attention to the intent of the question. That reaction is not uncommon for Navajos, particularly when the question comes near the end of a long and often dull interview. In any case, the figure

TABLE XXXVI

RESPONSES TO INTERVIEW QUESTION EIGHT COMPARED TO RESULTS OF THE CHICAGO STUDY: HAVE YOU EVER VISITED YOUR CHILD'S CLASSROOM?

Responses	Per Cent So Responding		
	Chicago Study[80]	Witherspoon Study	
	Rough Rock	Rough Rock	
Yes	59	45	
No	37	55	
Other	4	0	
	Rock Point	Nazlini	
Yes	53	30	
No	47	70	
	Chinle BIA	Many Farms BIA	
Yes	73	14	
No	27	86	
	Chinle Public	Many Farms Public	Kayenta Public
Yes	33	6	40
No	56	94	60
Other	11	0	0

---

[80] *Ibid.*

that 73 per cent of the parents of students at the Chinle Boarding School had visited the classrooms of their children is highly open to question, especially considering that all parents in the Chinle area were excluded from the sample. It would be downright astonishing if ten per cent of this group had visited the classrooms of their children. Although the figures for Nazlini, Chinle Public and Kayenta are also open to question, the possible error is not as obvious. The fact that dorm parents often visit classrooms makes the figures for Rock Point and Rough Rock more likely to be correct.

The responses to question ten in the Rough Rock study seem to contrast most to the responses obtained by the Chicago team to the same question, as shown in Table XXXVII.

Beyond the "no response or nothing in particular" category, there is little correlation in the answers to this question. The answers as reported show no particular bias for or against Rough Rock, so bias can be ruled out as a reason for the difference in answers. This question is a little tricky and the interpretation into Navajo involves a complex sentence. Over half the parents did not answer the question. It is an open ended question that would normally receive many varied answers. The researcher has to compile the responses into categories. Somewhere along the line the differences may be accounted for, but it is impossible to know just where and the differences are not important enough to require any greater attention.

TABLE XXXVII

RESPONSES TO INTERVIEW QUESTION TEN COMPARED TO THE RESULTS OF THE CHICAGO STUDY: WHAT SHOULD YOUR CHILD LEARN IN SCHOOL THAT HE IS NOT NOW LEARNING?

Responses	Per Cent So Responding	
	Chicago Study[81]	Witherspoon Study
	Rough Rock	Rough Rock
No response or nothing in particular	55	73
Child plays around too much, doesn't work hard enough	26	0
Vocational skills	0	27
Some specific subject	11	0
	Rock Point	Nazlini
No response or nothing in particular	65	13
Some specific subject	18	14
Vocational skills	0	40
Navajo language and culture	0	27
Child plays around too much	12	0
	Chinle BIA	Many Farms BIA
No response or nothing in particular	46	64
Vocational skills	0	27
Child plays around too much	18	0
Social skills	0	14
Some specific subject	18	0

---

[81] *Ibid.*, p. 3.37.

TABLE XXXVII (continued)

Responses	Per Cent So Responding		
	Chicago Study	Witherspoon Study	
	Chinle Public	Many Farms Public	Kay-enta Public
No response or nothing in particular	67	50	26
Vocational skills	0	28	74
Navajo language and culture	0	17	8
Social skills	22	0	0

The last question common to both studies concerns the teaching of Navajo culture in the school program. The responses to this question are shown in Table XXXVIII.

Although there seems to be a little qualification of some sort in a small number of responses in the Chicago study, the responses in all cases are so overwhelmingly positive that there is nothing to question or doubt. The Chicago study added a corollary to this question which produced some interesting results, as shown in Table XXXIX.

The fact that the parents want instruction in Navajo culture for their children and are not getting any, except at Rough Rock and to a slight extent at Rock Point, is a major indictment of the schools.

The Chicago study also asked the parents whether they preferred day schools or boarding schools. As was the case in the Witherspoon study reported earlier, theparents of public school students preferred day schools while the parents of boarding school students preferred boarding schools.[83] The parents living closest to paved roads preferred day schools and the parents living in the least accessible areas preferred boarding schools. Again the two studies seem to validate each other.

Although the Chicago study and the Witherspoon study were done under the direction of two different individuals with different levels of commitment and possibly contrasting interests, the responses obtained and reported seem very

---

[83] Ibid., p. 3.39.

TABLE XXXVIII

RESPONSES TO INTERVIEW QUESTION ELEVEN COMPARED TO THE RESULTS OF THE CHICAGO STUDY: DO YOU THINK YOUR CHILD SHOULD BE TAUGHT AT SCHOOL ABOUT THE NAVAJO WAY OF LIFE?

Responses	Per Cent So Responding		
	Chicago Study[82]	Witherspoon Study	
	Rough Rock	Rough Rock	
Yes	85	100	
No	7	0	
Other	7	0	
	Rock Point	Nazlini	
Yes	88	100	
No	0	0	
Other	12	0	
	Chinle BIA	Many Farms BIA	
Yes	73	100	
No	9	0	
Other	18	0	
	Chinle Public	Many Farms Public	Kay-enta Public
Yes	78	100	90
No	0	0	8
Other	22	0	2

---

[82] *Ibid.*, p. 3.36.

TABLE XXXIX

RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION OF THE CHICAGO STUDY: IS IT BEING TAUGHT AT YOUR SCHOOL?

Responses	Per Cent So Responding			
	Rough Rock	Rock Point	Chinle BIA	Chinle Public
Yes	96	41	0	0
No	0	41	82	89
Don't know	4	18	18	11

similar where they could be expected to be similar. This, however, does not necessarily mean that both studies are valid and truly represent the opinions of Navajo parents. It could mean that both studies are equally invalid, although the similarity adds credence to both studies. The similarity does vouch for the honesty and integrity of all the researchers of both studies. If a bias does exist, it must come through in the conclusions the researchers draw from the data, not in the data itself.

Although the report of the Chicago study is readily available, it might be helpful to briefly mention the general results of some questions which were not part of the Witherspoon study. The Chicago study indicated that more parents at Rough Rock had taken part in adult education programs than anywhere else.[84]

Four questions in the Chicago study attempted to get a view of how the schools might have influenced community attitudes and progress. In response to the question, "How do circumstances in this community today compare with what they were five years ago?", a higher per centage of Rough Rock parents answered "better" than those elsewhere.[85] With the exception of Chinle BIA, all groups had a strong majority answering "better."

In response to the questions, "What has been done during the last five years to help local Navajos make more money and live better? Who did these things?", 52 per cent of the parents from Rough Rock said it was the local school. None of the other schools were near this mark.[86] In response to the question, "Is there much that local Navajos can do to make things better?", 85 per cent of the Rough Rock parents answered "yes." The closest to this was the Chinle Public School group, of whom 67 per cent answered "yes." The per centages for Rock Point and Chinle BIA were 35 and 9 respectively.[87] The results of these two questions strongly indicate that the school at Rough Rock has improved the lives of the people at Rough Rock and increased their self-esteem and beliefs in themselves.

---

[84] Ibid., p. 3.33.

[85] Ibid., p. 3.47.

All of the groups, except Chinle BIA, felt that things would be better five years from now. Most wanted more jobs specifically, while the Rough Rock parents emphasized the need for better roads.[88] More parents at Rough Rock and Rock Point could think of people at the school whom most Navajos liked that could parents elsewhere.[89] Likewise, more parents at Rough Rock and Rock Point could think of persons at the school whom they disliked.[90] This indicates more interaction between the school staff and the community at Rough Rock and Rock Point than elsewhere.

---

[86] Ibid., p. 3.49.

[87] Ibid., p. 3.50.

[88] Ibid., p. 3.49.

[89] Ibid., p. 3.34.

[90] Ibid.

Although about half the parents from Rough Rock and Rock Point, compared to 22 per cent a Chinle Public, felt the school board members were interested in their opinions,[91] only about one in six of both groups had actually talked with board members about education.[92] When asked if the school board had final say-so on what is done at the school, over 80 per cent of all parents said "yes."[93] Over half the parents at Chinle Public said their children had learned things at school which had made them disrespectful to their parents or made their parents feel sad. No other group was above the one-third mark on this question, although Rough Rock was closest to it.

The Chicago study also had one general approval-disapproval question which drew some significant results. The question was, "Is the school following what most Navajos want for their children?" An overwhelming 96 per cent of the parents at Rough Rock answered this question affirmatively. The per centage at Rock Point was 75, 67 at Chinle Public, and only 20 per cent at Chinle BIA.[95] The results of this question clearly indicate how the people of Rough Rock feel about their school. It is unfortunate that the Chicago team did notpay more attention to how the community people felt about their school, and less attention to minor and major problems of inefficient administration and operation. The data from parent interviews conducted by the Chicago staff and/or the data collected from the Witherspoon study simply do not support many of the conclusions of the Chicago team. Those conclusions will not be reported here but are readily available.[96] The preface to their conclusions indicates that the Chicago team was not clear and sure about whether their data supported their conclusions:

---

[91] Ibid., p. 3.25.

[92] Ibid.

[93] Ibid.

[94] Ibid., p. 3.36.

[95] Ibid., p. 3.34.

> We should reiterate at this point that unequivocal evidence is difficult to obtain on questions of the type considered in this chapter. In drawing conclusions, we acknowledge that other interpretations are possible and in many cases plausible. What follows is the picture we consider most warranted by the data.[97]

In the final chapter of this thesis, a summary of conclusions to be drawn from the data will be made. It will be for the reader to decide whether the data collected in this study and related studies warrant the conclusions drawn. The major differences in the study presented here and the Chicago study are not basically differences in data obtained; the differences are in the conclusions drawn from the data.

---

[96] *Ibid.*, p. 3.51-58, 9.1-10.

[97] *Ibid.*, p. 3.51.

Having completed a lengthy comparison between the Chicago study and the one reported here, the next task is to take a look at the study done by the Navajo team. The many contrasts between the research done by the Navajo team and the Chicago study have already been discussed. In general, the Navajo research was a subjective, humanistic evaluation done by those who were best able to communicate with the people and understandthe situation.

The school board at Rough Rock wanted an evaluation by Navajos for several reasons. One reason was that the non-Navajo evaluators had spent most of their time with the people with whom they could best communicate. The fact that most of the Navajo staff and community people find it uneasy to communicate in English meant that those staff members were not questioned equally along with the non-Navajo staff. The board wanted to see an evaluation which emphasized the Navajo viewpoint.[98]

In analyzing community-school relations at Rough Rock, the Navajo team focused their research on four questions: (1) Is the community in control of the school? (2) Is the school educating the community? (3) Do you want the community in control of the school? (4) Is it better for the child to be in dormitories or at home?[99]

In answering the first question concerning whether the community was in control of the school, the Navajo team declared:

---

[98] Billison _et. al._, _op. cit._, p. 21.

[99] _Ibid._, p. 23.

> The strongest point in favor of community control is that the community is definitely in control, and control through representation on the school board. The next emphasis is obvious in the fact control is understood in the community. . . . It is very much evident that most of the answers are positively in favor of community control.[100]

In regard to the question about whether the school is educating the community, the Navajo team made the following statement:

> The strongest answer received to this question is that the adult education program is accomplishing this goal. The fact that local people have been hired as dormitory and teacher aides is a strong factor in educating the community. Monthly community school meetings have a great deal to add to community education. An unequivocal "yes" in the fact of community education is very much apparent. There is also indication that the Navajo aim toward harmonious goals is still very strong, andthat there is a positive feeling of involvement in school affairs. Again the community people have indicated an overwhelmingly positive attitude toward school to community and community to school relations.[101]

In discussing the responses to the question concerning whether the respondent desired community control, the Navajo evaluators stated that two-thirds of the responses favored community control.[102]

The responses to the question about whether dormitory or day schools were best brought out the same kind of responses as were found in the Chicago and Witherspoon studies:

---

[100] Ibid., pp. 24-25.

[101] Ibid., p. 25.

[102] Ibid.

> The overwhelming wish of the school and community at Rough Rock is to have the children go to school from home. The next largest answers the need for good roads in order to keep the children at home. There are some mixed feelings about the benefits the home has to offer, and this would indicate that more time needs to lapse before the question can be fully answered. The confusion on this point says that most of the parents have been educated in dormitory life, and that they do not know nor have they experienced a better system.[103]

The Navajo evaluation team also made some general conclusions. They said that the people wanted "Navajo education for Navajo children."[104] They concluded that at Rough Rock there was better education than elsewhere in Navajoland because the people are involved and the school is thinking in terms of the total community.[105] The summary declaration of the Navajo team is this:

> And what they have said, collectively, is that community education and tribal education are what there is to be desired. Community education is what Navajos as well as other tribes are working to get. Community education is what communities desire. Community education is a factor in keeping the community together. It is a system that binds people together--much stronger. It is an ideal most looked for but most rarely achieved. But at Rough Rock it is being achieved.[106]

The findings and conclusions of the Navajo evaluation team are in basic agreement with the findings presented in this thesis paper. The Navajo team concluded that the community was in control of the school through the school board. The Chicago study showed that 92 per cent of the parents at Rough Rock felt that the school board had final "say-so." Both the Chicago study and Witherspoon study showed the Rough Rock parents to be much better informed concerning the existence, identity of members, and functions of the school board.

---

[103] Ibid., p. 27.

[104] Ibid., p. 28.

[105] Ibid.

[106] Ibid., pp. 28-29.

The Navajo evaluation team also concluded that the school was educating the community. The Chicago study showed that more Navajo parents at Rough Rock than elsewhere had participated in adult education programs. Rough Rock parents were on the top or close to the top on knowledge of teachers, administrators, and the school board, had made more classroom visits, and knew more things and people at the school that they liked and disliked. The Chicago study also showed that the school at Rough Rock had had a powerful positive influence on community attitudes of self-confidence and optimism. All of this data supports the conclusion that the school is educating the community.

The third major question and corresponding conclusion was that the people did in fact want community control. Question six of the Witherspoon study showed that 85 per cent of the parents at Rough Rock and 74 per cent elsewhere did desire local control. The Chicago study did not focus on this matter directly, but 96 per cent of the Rough Rock parents interviewed in the Chicago study stated that the school was following what most local Navajos wanted for their children.

The dormitory or day school question was a fourth area of investigation for the Navajo team. The Navajo team found the same pragmatic responses to this question as were found by the other two studies. From an overall point of view, the parents at Rough Rock seem very consistent in their attitudes toward the demonstration school and education in general. The final chapter will attempt to summarize the major points and conclusions that can be drawn from the data collected as a part of this thesis paper.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In Chapter I of this thesis, four major principles of education in America were outlined and articulated. It was pointed out that these four principles were deep-rooted in our democratic beliefs in government by, of, and for the people. The task of this thesis, as outlined in Chapter I, is to determine, as nearly as possible, how well the six schools in the study are following the four traditional principles of community-school relations in American education. The Rough Rock Demonstration School is the school of major interest in this regard, and the others are included mostly for the purposes of comparison. To proceed with the summary analysis, each of the four principles will be restated and discussed in the light of the data collected as a part of this study.

The first principle of community-school relations in American education concerns the school as an institution of the people:

> (I) Schools are institutions of the people, to serve the people, to respect their values and beliefs, and to be under the control and direction of the people whose children attend them.

The responses of parents to the interview questions have shown that this ideal has been more nearly attained at Rough Rock than elsewhere. The parents at Rough Rock clearly know more about their school and school board than those in any of the other areas. Navajo parents want their language and culture respected and taught, and only at Rough Rock is this being done in any substantial or satisfactory way. A good majority (64%) of the parents at Rough Rock are pleased with the local school board, whileno more than one in four parents in the other Navajo areas were satisfied with their local boards. A remarkable 96 per cent of the parents at Rough Rock said they felt that the school was following what most local Navajos want for their children. The other schools were substantially lower on this question in the Chicago study.

Even though the results of this study clearly indicate that the demonstration school at Rough Rock is much closer to being a democratic institution of the people than other schools serving Navajos, it must be remembered that the competition is terribly weak. Against competition, some of which do not even pretend to be institutions of the people, Rough Rock looks very strong and even Rock Point looks good; but measured against the ideal, Rough Rock has a good distance to go. The Chicago report discusses the problems of Rough Rock in this regard in a way that is misleading but cannot be completely ignored.[107] The people at Rough Rock must not rest on their laurels or just be content to proclaim how much better they are than elsewhere. Likewise, other schools and agencies must not ignore the achievements of Rough Rock and the rights of the Navajo people to Navajo education.

---

[107] Erickson and Schwartz, op. cit., pp. 3.13-3.30.

A second major principle of community-school relations in American education concerns parental participation in the school program:

> (2) Extensive participation of parents in the school program is a right, an obligation, and a necessity. Schools must encourage and stimulate such participation.

The parents at Rough Rock know more things they like and dislike about the school and more people they like and dislike at the school. The Rough Rock parents know more school board members than parents elsewhere, and are better informed concerning the functions of school boards than any group of parents except the Tempe group. The study here shows that more parents at Rough Rock know the teachers of their children than any other group of Navajo parents. More Rough Rock parents knew the principal or head of their school than any other group of parents. The Rough Rock parents knew much more about the school curriculum than any of the other groups of Navajo parents. Increased knowledge of the school program is a definite by-product of parental participation. The substantially greater knowledge of the school program and personalities possessed by the Rough Rock parents is a strong indication that parents at Rough Rock are most closely reaching the goal of parental participation in the school program.

In questions dealing with actual participation in one or more aspects of the school program, parents at Rough Rock again are on the top. More parents at Rough Rock than elsewhere have participated in adult education programs. This study shows that more parents at Rough Rock have visited the classrooms of their children than parents elsewhere. The figures in the Chicago study do not agree with this last point but, as discussed earlier, the Chicago figures in this regard are highly questionable, to say the least. Only the Rock Point group matches the number of parents who have talked with board members about education.

All the data mentioned above conclusively show that Rough Rock parents participate in their school to a much higher degree than do Navajo or Anglo parents elsewhere. Again, the competition is weak both in Navajo and Anglo schools. Part of the reason Rough Rock is so consistently high in this area is that the other schools are so consistently low, with a couple of exceptions at Rock Point and Tempe. On the other hand, it takes a Rough Rock to show how terribly little parental participation there is in Navajo education and in American education in general.

A third general principle of community-school relations articulated in Chapter I concerns teacher-parent understanding and cooperation:

> (3) Teachers and parents have a mutual responsibility to work together to serve the

> best interests of the child, recognizing the basic responsibility of parents for their children and respecting the teachings and relationships formed in the home.

The data from the parent interviews on this rea is not as extensive as it should be to draw definite conclusions. The data does show that more parents and teachers are acquainted with each other at Rough Rock than elsewhere except Tempe. The data also shows that more parents have visited classrooms and teachers visited homes at Rough Rock than elsewhere, with the exception of Tempe on the former point. However, the shining example in this area is the extensive parent-teacher conferences at the two Tempe schools. It is quite evident that there is more teacher-parent understanding and cooperation at Tempe than elsewhere. The parents and teachers at Tempe, for the most part, share a common cultural, social, racial, and linguistic background. This is not true in Navajo education. This fact, however, does not justify the weaker parent-teacher relations in Navajo education but points to the greater need for more parent-teacher communication and cooperation. Rough Rock has done best in fulfilling this need, although it too has a long way to go to reach the ideal.

A fourth major principle of American education concerns the responsibility of schools to keep parents informed concerning the school programs and operation:

> (4) Schools have a responsibility to provide parents with accessible, accurate, and adequate information about the school program and operation.

As mentioned and illustrated numerous times in this paper, the Rough Rock parents are by far the best informed with regard to their school. Nevertheless, there were some areas of definite inadequacy in parental knowledge of the school at Rough Rock. An important one was in the area of the functions of the school board. Although Rough Rock was well ahead of the other Navajo groups on this matter, it was well behind the Tempe group. Although higher than the others, parental knowledge of teachers and school curriculum at Rough Rock was not as great as it should be. Community education meetings have not been as regular as they should be. In general, however, the Rough Rock Demonstration School has made a highly commendable effort to keep parents informed about the school, and Rough Rock is far ahead of the other Navajo schools in this regard.

This concludes the evaluation of community-school relations at Rough Rock on the basis of objective data. This summary will close with a few subjective observations.

When reports focus on problems, as does the Chicago report, there is a danger of overlooking or underestimating significant overall achievements. Likewise, when reports focus on accomplishments, as does much of the literature on Rough Rock, problems tend to be ignored—sometimes even by those who ought to be solving them. There is a need for both kinds of reports and a balance between the two. Just as the Chicago report is misleading and hardly gives an accurate picture of what is happening at Rough Rock of significance, the Johnson volume[108] focuses so much on the achievements of Rough Rock that it fails to adequately portray a school struggling hard to reach its ideals and to solve its many problems, often falling short of the mark.

The Chicago report sorely accuses Rough Rock administrators for exaggerating successes and ignoring failures, for selling rather than producing, and for preaching rather than doing.[109] It fails, however, to recognize the courage, faith and dedicated efforts of many people to reach previously unattained goals in Navajo education and for pioneering in many different areas. But most importantly, it fails to see what the demonstration school means to the people of Rough Rock, and the hope and dream it holds for all Navajos and all American Indians. The team of Navajo evaluators know this best and have expressed it most eloquently:

> Based on this study it is evident that the parents and the community are involved and know what is going on in their school. There is a feeling of great pride in the people--pride in what they are doing for their community, pride in what they are doing for their school, and pride in what they are doing for their children....
>
> And what they have said, collectively, is that community education and tribal education are what there is to be desired. Community

---

[108] Broderick H. Johnson, Navajo Education at Rough Rock (Rough Rock: Rough Rock Demonstration School, 1968).

[109] Erickson and Schwartz, op. cit., pp. 9.4-6.

> education is what Navajos as well as other tribes are working to get. Community education is what communities desire. Community education is a factor in keeping the community together. It is a system that binds people together--much stronger. It is an ideal most looked for but most rarely achieved. But at Rough Rock it is being achieved.[110]

It seems appropriate, at this subjective place, to give the last word to the dynamic and fearless leader of the Rough Rock school during its inception and infancy, Robert Roessel. Roessel has been much abused and much honored, and he deserves to be heard:

> The importance and true significance of the Rough Rock Demonstration School never can be conveyed in a single book, or, for that matter, in many books. However, this volume deals with the heart of the school.
>
> That heart lies not in the school's TESL program (Teaching English as a Second Language) nor in its music or speech therapy work, nor even in the additional money that has been made available to it. The heart lies in the involvement of Indian parents and the leadership of the all-Navajo school board....
>
> The history of American education is filled with certain concepts which long have been denied American Indians. American education has had as its cornerstone and foundation the local community and the involvement of the people served by the school itself. However, Indian education has been characterized by outsiders who in their positions of authority and expertise made the decisions and directed the way....[111]
>
> In a day and age in which the average American plays an ever decreasing role in decision making, and in which each person's part in

---

[110] Billison et. al., op. cit., pp. 33, 28-29.

[111] Broderick H. Johnson, op. cit., in Foreword.

> providing control and leadership in public education is at an all-time low, Rough Rock stands as a light in the night with an unmistakeable message. This small, isolated school is drawing attention from all portions of this country, to the principles on which this nation was founded.[112]

In keeping with the character if the Rough Rock Demonstration School as an institution of the people, it seems pertinent and appropriate to allow the people themselves to evaluate their own school.

This thesis has attempted to shed more light on how the people of Rough Rock feel about their school.

---

[112] Robert A. Roessel, Jr., "An Overview of the Rough Rock Demonstration School," Journal of American Indian Education, May, 1958, vol. 7, no. 3, p. 13.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Public Documents

Berry, Brewton. *The Education of American Indians: A Survey of the Literature*. U.S. Congress, Senate, Special Subcommittee on Indian Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. 91st Congress, 1st Session, 1969.

U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Branch of Education. *Orienting New Employees*. Chilocco, Oklahoma: Chilocco School Press, 1956.

U.S. Congress, Senate. *Hearings: Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare*. 90th Congress, 9st and 2nd Sessions, Part II, 1968.

Young, Robert W. *The Navajo Yearbook of Planning in Action.* U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, Navajo Agency, 1955.

II. Books

Adams, Evelyn C. *American Indian Education.* New York: King Crown Press, 1946.

Cohen, Felix S. *The Legal Conscience.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960.

Johnson, Broderick H. *Navajo Education at Rough Rock.* Rough Rock, Arizona: Rough Rock Demonstration School, 1968.

Jones, James J. and Irving W. Stout. *School Public Relations.* New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1960.

Kindred, Leslie W. *School Public Relations.* Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1957.

McCloskey, Gordon. *Education and Public Understanding.* New York: Harper and Row, 1959.

Roessel, Robert A., Jr. *Handbook for Indian Education.* Los Angeles: Amerindian Publishing Co.

Sumption, Merle R. and Yvonne Engstrom. *School-Community Relations: A New Approach.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966.

Thayer, V. T. *The Role of the School in American Society.* New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1960.

Westby-Gibson, Dorothy. *Social Perspectives on Education.* New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1965.

III. Articles and Periodicals

Collier, John, Sr. "Fullness of Life Through Leisure," in *Mind-Body Relationship*, J. B. Nash, ed. New York: A. S. Barnes and Co., 1931.

Education Digest, XI (November, 1951), 32-33.

Knepler, Abraham E. "Education in the Cherokee Nation," *Chronicles of Oklahoma*, vol. XXI, part 4 (December, 1943), 378-401.

Knepler, Abraham E. "Eighteenth Century Cherokee Educational Efforts," *Chronicles of Oklahoma*, vol. XX, part I (March, 1942), 55-61.

"Local Control: Secret of School's Success," *Nations Business* (February, 1964), pp. 68-70.

"New NEA Code of Ethics," *National Education Association Journal* (September, 1952), 372-5.

Roessel, Robert A. Jr. "An Overview of the Rough Rock Demonstration School," *Journal of American Indian Education*, vol. 7, no. 3 (May, 1958), 2-14.

Stout, Irving W. and Grace Langdon, "What Parents Want to Know About their Child's School," *The Nation's Schools*, vol. 60, no. 2 (August, 1957), 45-48.

IV. Reports

Billison, Samuel W., John Y. Begay, Herbert Blatchford, Sr., and Henry D. Gatewood, II. *Navajo Evaluators Look* at the Rough Rock Demonstration School. Rough Rock, Arizona, June, 1969.

Erickson, Donald A. and Henrietta Schwartz. Community School at Rough Rock, an evaluation for the Office of Economic Opportunity. Chicago, mimeographed by authors, April, 1969.

Woerner, Davida. Education Among the Navajo: an Historical Study. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation at Columbia University, 1941.